



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## APPENDIX.

---

- I. PROCEEDINGS OF THE FOURTEENTH ANNUAL SESSION,  
CAMBRIDGE, 1882.
- II. TREASURER'S REPORT.
- III. LIST OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS.
- IV. CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION.
- V. PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

## MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE FOURTEENTH ANNUAL SESSION.

(From the Autograph Registry Slips.)

Frederic D. Allen, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 William F. Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.  
 Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.  
 Charles E. Bennett, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
 Lucius H. Buckingham, English High School, Boston, Mass.  
 Henry F. Burton, University of Rochester, N. Y.  
 William C. Cattell, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
 Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
 William W. Eaton, Andover, Mass.  
 Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 Frank M. Gilley, Chelsea, Mass.  
 William Greenwood, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Isaac H. Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
 Milton W. Humphreys, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.  
 Hans C. G. Jagemann, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 John Norton Johnson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Robert P. Keep, Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass.  
 Thaddeus D. Kenneson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Thomas B. Lindsay, Boston University, Boston, Mass.  
 Jules Luquiens, Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.  
 Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
 Philippe B. Marcou, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
 C. K. Nelson, Brookeville Academy, Brookeville, Md.  
 W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
 Charles W. Park, Bombay, India.  
 Tracy Peck, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
 William T. Peck, High School, Providence, R. I.  
 B. Perrin, Western Reserve College, Cleveland, Ohio.  
 Edward D. Perry, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
 Samuel Porter, National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.  
 Henry Preble, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Charles P. G. Scott, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
 J. B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass.  
 Thomas D. Seymour, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
 Clement L. Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Frank Webster Smith, Lincoln, Mass.  
 William A. Stevens, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.  
 Frank B. Tarbell, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
 Edward M. Tomlinson, Alfred University, Alfred Centre, N. Y.  
 Crawford H. Toy, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 James C. Van Benschoten, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.  
 Henry C. Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 Minton Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 John H. Wheeler, University of Virginia.  
 John Williams White, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 William D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
 Joseph Colver Wightman, Taunton, Mass.  
 John Henry Wright, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. [Total, 52.]

# AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., Tuesday, July 11, 1882.

THE Fourteenth Annual Session was called to order at 3 P. M., in the Assembly Room of the Faculty of Harvard College (University Hall), by the President, Professor Frederic D. Allen of Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.

The Treasurer, Mr. Charles J. Buckingham of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., presented his report. The summary of the year's income and expenses is as follows :

## RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, July 13, 1881 . . . . .	\$418.46
Fees, assessments, and arrears paid in . . . . .	\$540.00
Sales of Transactions . . . . .	399.50
Interest on deposits . . . . .	17.25
Total receipts for the year . . . . .	956.75
	<u>\$1,375.21</u>

## EXPENDITURES.

Balance due on Printing for 1880 (vol. xi.) . . . . .	365.40
Plates for Proceedings for 1881 (vol. xii.) <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	115.83
600 copies of Proceedings for 1881, separate . . . . .	29.30
Plates for Transactions for 1881 (vol. xii.) <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	222.22
600 copies of vol. xii. (Tr. and Pr. together) <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	103.50
Reprints of separate articles for authors . . . . .	37.00
Postages . . . . .	65.85
Mailing, shipping, and expressages . . . . .	35.05
Job-printing . . . . .	39.10
Copying . . . . .	2.60
Sundries . . . . .	14.23
Total expenditures for the year <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	1,030.08
Balance <sup>3</sup> on hand, July 10, 1882 . . . . .	345.13
	<u>\$1,375.21</u>

<sup>1</sup> The sum of items 2, 4, and 5 gives the cost of composition, corrections, electrotyping, press-work, paper, binding, etc., for vol. xii., viz., \$441.55.

<sup>2</sup> This sum really includes, besides the expenses of the last fiscal year, the great bulk of the expenses of the preceding.

<sup>3</sup> An oversight (involving an error against himself) was made by the Treasurer, in omitting to enter the *sum* of a bill for \$65, the *items* of which he had already entered. A true voucher for this sum of \$65 is in the Treasurer's hands. The reported balance of \$410.13 is therefore here corrected.

The bond of the Connecticut Western Railroad Company, numbered 960, for \$500, with 13 semi-annual and unpaid coupons of \$17.50 each attached thereto, being the same lately held by the American Philological Association, was exchanged by its Treasurer, July 10, 1882, at Hartford, Ct., for certificate, No. 781, of three shares, of One Hundred dollars each, of the Hartford and Connecticut Western Railroad Company, made payable to C. J. Buckingham, Treasurer of the American Philological Association.

On motion, the Chair appointed Professor J. C. Van Benschoten and Professor Henry F. Burton a committee to audit the Treasurer's report.

The Secretary, Professor Charles R. Lanman of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., presented the following report of the Executive Committee :

*a.* The Committee had elected as members of the Association ;

Rufus B. Richardson, Ph. D., Professor of Latin, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

John H. Wright, Professor of Greek, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

William H. Hawkes, M. D., Washington, D. C.

John Norton Johnson, A. M., Graduate Student, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Charles Darwin, Librarian of the Geological Survey, Washington, D. C.

W. S. Scarborough, Professor of Ancient Languages, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.

James C. Mackenzie, Ph. D., Principal of Classical School, Wilkesbarre, Pa.

Ralph L. Goodrich, Clerk of U. S. Courts, Little Rock, Ark.

Henry Johnson, Professor of Modern Languages, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.

Clement L. Smith, Professor of Latin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

James A. Harrison, Professor of English, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

Philippe B. Marcou, Instructor in French, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

William G. Hale, Professor of Latin, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Jules Luquiens, Professor of Modern Languages, Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.

Edward Delavan Perry, Tutor in Greek and Sanskrit, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.

John H. Wheeler, Professor of Greek, University of Virginia.

George M. Lane, Professor of Latin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Frank M. Gilley, Teacher of Classics, High School of Chelsea, Mass.

John Avery, Professor of Greek, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.

William H. Treadwell, Instructor in Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Frank Webster Smith, Graduate Student, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

S. E. D. Currier, Roxbury, Mass.

*b.* The Proceedings of the session of July, 1881, had been published November 17, 1881. The Transactions for the same year had been published February 13, 1882.

c. By advice and with consent of the Executive Committee the Secretary had distributed thirty-five complete sets of the Transactions among the principal foreign libraries and learned societies. They had been forwarded free from Washington to their several destinations by the Smithsonian Institution. The list is given on pages lviii, lix. The Secretary had also sent copies of the eleventh and twelfth volumes of the Transactions to fifty of the principal libraries of the United States, *gratis*, with a circular, offering to complete the set for twelve dollars (half the old price). As a result of these and other efforts, since about the beginning of 1881, he had sold publications of the Association to the amount of \$530.50. The advantages of these sales were twofold: one of the fundamental objects of the Association, "the diffusion of philological knowledge," was thereby furthered, and the condition of the treasury was bettered. The libraries which thus become subscribers to the publications of the Association are given on pages lvii, lviii.

d. The bills against the Association, especially the printers' bills, had been paid early and promptly, and the balance of \$345 in the treasury was therefore much more significant than usual, inasmuch as heretofore the bills for printing had often run over from one fiscal year to another. The Association had no debts save a few small current dues.

e. The Executive Committee had voted to continue the reduction in the price of *complete sets* of the Transactions. A complete set, accordingly, now costs \$12, and will, upon the appearance of the thirteenth volume, cost \$13. The price of volumes not sold in complete sets will be \$1.50 apiece, to members and non-members alike; and no reduction will be made on this price, except, of course, that for orders for nine, ten, or eleven volumes not more than the price of a complete set will be charged.

f. The Committee gave their approval to the advertising of the publications of the Association in "The Publishers' Trade-List Annual," and directed the Secretary to continue the same.

g. The Committee recommended the adoption of the amendment to the Constitution which had been proposed in due form (see *Proceedings for 1881*, p. 15) at the previous meeting, and by which the annual assessment would be reduced from five dollars to three dollars.

The Committee proposed the following arrangement for the hours of the sessions: for Tuesday evening, from 8 o'clock until the close of the President's address; for Wednesday, from 9 A. M. to 1 P. M., and from 2 to 4; for Thursday, from 9 A. M. to 1 P. M., and from 2.15 to 6 if an afternoon session should be necessary. The arrangement was accepted without objection.

The proposed amendment to the Constitution was adopted.

The Secretary presented an invitation from Colonel Theodore Lyman, extending to the members of the Association the hospitalities of his home in Brookline. It was accepted with thanks.

Communications were then presented as follows:

1. The Written Alphabet of our Colonial Fathers, by Mr. J. B. Sewall, of Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass.

The earliest records of the town of Braintree, Mass., bear the date of 1643. The most interesting of its early documents is the original deed of Wampatuck, Sagamore, dated August 5, 1665, conveying the territory of the original town to its first inhabitants. This document is written in some degree ornamentally, but, for the most part, in a plain, careful hand. The letters of the alphabet differ very considerably from those of to-day. (Enlarged copies of the forms used in the deed were here exhibited.)

In the records, the Anglo-Saxon form of *e* occurs, and also the German form of *r*, and a form for *th*, which, curiously, does not occur in the deed, viz., the character *y*. Most striking is the general resemblance to the German written alphabet. Letters having the same or nearly the same form with the German are: capitals, *B, C, D, H, M, N, P, S, V, W, Y*; small, *a, c, d, f, h, i, k, l, m, n, p, r, s, u, v, y, z*. The similarity of capitals to the form of Old English printed capitals is also noticeable. In the diary of the Rev. Samuel Niles (the first pastor of the present First Church of Braintree), commencing November, 1697, the Anglo-Saxon form of *e* is frequent in the earlier part, but not in the later. A form for *c*, resembling a small written *t*, is frequent, but not invariable, as in *Massachusetts*. The question is suggested whether this fact has anything to do with the spelling *Massathusetts*, which is sometimes to be met with. For the letter *h*, besides the present form, there is a form resembling our capital *E* dropped one half or more below the line. In the Wampatuck deed this form is only final; in the Plymouth records its position does not seem to be limited.

The form for *th*, except in the deed, and in the Niles diary after 1721, is *y*. In the diary it appears in *y<sup>r</sup>* and *y'*; in the records, in *y<sup>r</sup>* and *y<sup>n</sup>*, and in the proper name *Bethiah*. In other documents, I have found also *y<sup>r</sup>* (there), *y<sup>r</sup>* (their), *y<sup>r</sup>of*, *y<sup>r</sup>by*, and *y<sup>r</sup>abouts*. This character, as Mr. Earle has shown in his *Philology of the English Tongue*, is a relic of the rune þ (*thorn*), which may be readily seen by reference to Anglo-Saxon facsimiles, e. g. in the Early English Text Society's volumes. There it is still clearly distinct in form from the letter *y*. The letter *y* was at last written in place of the rune, but always retained, of course, the phonetic value of *thorn*, except indeed now-a-days, when it is often pronounced as *y* (in the article *y<sup>r</sup>*, for example) by persons ignorant of the history of the matter when reading mock-antique or archaistic newspaper paragraphs. After the ambiguity in the value of the character *y* arose, and the true *thorn* had been given up, the sound of *thorn* came to be written with the digraph *th*. It is interesting to find so many relics of the Anglo-Saxon written alphabet at so late a date.

Professor John Williams White of Harvard University, as Chairman of the Committee appointed (see *Proceedings for 1881*, pp. 15, 16) to confer with the American Association for the Advancement of Science on the subject of granting the degree of Doctor of Philosophy *honoris causa*, reported as follows:—

The Committee, consisting originally of Professors White, Manatt, and Lanman, was subsequently enlarged to five by the addition of Professors Whitney and Gildersleeve. The Resolutions adopted by the American Philological Association at Cleveland, July, 1881 (see *Proceedings for 1881*, p. 4), were presented by the Chairman of the Committee to the American Association for the Ad-

vancement of Science, at Cincinnati, in August, 1881 (see *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, vol. xxx. pp. 373-377), and action was taken thereon as is shown by the following extract from the volume last cited:—

“The following resolutions were reported to the Standing Committee by a sub-committee, with the recommendation that they be brought before the Association for action:

“*Whereas*, Many colleges in the United States have in recent years conferred the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, not by examination, but *honoris causa*:

“*Resolved*, 1. That this Association concurs with the American Philological Association in deprecating the removal of this degree from the class to which it belongs (viz.: B. D., LL. B., M. D., and Ph. D., degrees conferred after examination), and its transfer to the class of honorary degrees.

“2. That a committee of six, including the President of the Association, be appointed by the Chair to co-operate with the Committee of the American Philological Association in addressing a memorial to the Boards of Trustees of all colleges in the United States empowered to confer degrees, stating the objections to conferring the degree of Doctor of Philosophy *honoris causa*, and praying them to discontinue the practice, if it exists in the colleges under their control.’

“The resolutions having been accepted by the Standing Committee, and the degree of Doctor of Science included in the recommendation, the report was submitted to the Association. The resolutions were thereupon, after discussion, unanimously adopted.”

In May, 1882, the joint committee of the two associations sent the following Memorial to the Boards of Control of 430 colleges in the United States. The answers to this communication, with a single exception, heartily concurred with the views expressed in the Memorial.

#### TO THE BOARD OF CONTROL OF

GENTLEMEN,—The undersigned, a joint Committee of the American Philological Association and of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, respectfully present for your consideration the resolutions appended to this communication; and in obedience to their instructions they ask your attention to the following facts.

The degree of Doctor of Philosophy has been adopted by American colleges from the universities of Germany. The faculties in nearly all German universities are four in number, — theology, law, medicine, and philosophy. The last embraces the humanities and the mathematical and natural sciences. In all respects the degree conferred in the faculty of philosophy is of equal dignity with the degrees conferred in the other faculties. In order to obtain it the candidate — if a native — must first have pursued successfully the studies of the gymnasium or *real-school*; must have been in residence at a university for three years; must present a thesis, which at many universities is printed; and must pass an examination. In Germany, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is as much a professional degree as that in Theology, Law, or Medicine.

When this degree was first transferred to this country, the conditions under which it was conferred abroad were rigidly maintained here. These conditions still exist in full force in the eight or ten universities which since that time have



provided courses of study in philosophy for Bachelors of Arts. But meanwhile the practice has been established of giving the degree *honoris causa*; and this practice has rapidly increased. The Reports of the United States Commissioner of Education at Washington for the years 1872-1879 inclusive prove that it has been transferred from the class of degrees given on examination to the class of honorary degrees. In these eight years the degree of Doctor of Philosophy was given *honoris causa* 170 times. The Commissioner's list includes 415 colleges, sixty-eight of which gave the degree *honoris causa*. The greatest number of times the degree was thus given by any one college is twelve; the smallest, one. It is a striking fact that in 75 per cent of these 170 cases the degree was given by colleges which had never conferred it by examination; whereas there are many distinguished colleges on the general list, which, having no provision for conferring the degree by examination, have abstained from giving it as a mere honor.

On the other hand, during these eight years the degree was conferred after examination 175 times, by twenty-four colleges. Thirteen of these at the same time gave it also *honoris causa*. Three of this number, however, gave it *honoris causa* each but once, and thereafter conferred it only by examination, the first nine, the second ten, and the third seventeen times. If we except these three colleges, the degree was conferred only seventeen times after examination by colleges which gave it also *honoris causa*. Eleven of the twenty-four colleges abstained altogether from giving the degree as a mere honor, and these eleven conferred it in all 122 times. This is about 70 per cent of the total number of 175 cases in which it was conferred after examination.

These statistics show that the degree of Doctor of Philosophy has been established in the United States as a professional degree; that at the same time it has been largely given as a purely honorary degree; but that in the great majority of instances this has been done by colleges which have not provided graduate courses of study in philosophy and have never conferred the degree after examination.

An inspection of the list of persons upon whom this degree has been conferred *honoris causa* by colleges in the United States leads the Committee to believe that a widespread misapprehension concerning its true intent and significance exists among Boards which possess the power of conferring academic honors. It has been regarded as a compliment to be bestowed on persons perhaps worthy of honorable distinction, but possessing no technical training in philosophy, and seems to have been considered an honor intermediate between the degrees of Master of Arts and Doctor of Laws. It has been conferred upon masters of high schools and principals of academies, whose capacity to manage such institutions, however conspicuous, is nevertheless not evidence of those professional acquirements which the degree of Doctor of Philosophy ought always to signify.

To confer the degree in this manner is to misuse it and ultimately to destroy its value; but all colleges are interested in maintaining it in its integrity. It is in a pre-eminent sense the appropriate degree for teachers, a large and growing class of persons in this country. Three colleges in the United States have within the last twenty years conferred this degree after examination upon 119 different persons, of whom 75 per cent have adopted the profession of teaching. It is reasonable to suppose that the number of colleges in the United States which within the next fifty years will establish graduate schools in philosophy will be

large. The degree which these schools will then confer will be that of Doctor of Philosophy, and it is for the interest of all alike that its significance should not be obscured. Looking at the degree in the light of its past and future significance, the impropriety of conferring it otherwise than by examination is obvious. There are no sufficient reasons for conferring this degree differently from the three other professional degrees, for example, from that of Doctor of Medicine, which is only rarely given *honoris causa* and which confers on its recipient peculiar professional privileges. Only six of the sixty-eight colleges mentioned above gave the degree of Doctor of Medicine *honoris causa* during the eight years covered by the Commissioner's reports. They so gave it eight times in all; but during the same time conferred it after examination 1546 times. Only one of these six institutions during the eight years conferred the degree of Doctor of Philosophy after examination.

The objections to conferring the degree of Doctor of Philosophy *honoris causa* apply equally to the degree of Doctor of Science. This degree is set apart for candidates in the general subject of philosophy who make special studies in the natural sciences; and the American Association for the Advancement of Science was led to include it in its resolutions from the fact that, although it is a degree which has only recently been conferred in the United States, it also has already been given *honoris causa*.

The Committee believe that a clear understanding of the facts on the part of the governing boards of colleges and universities will stay the evil so earnestly deprecated by the two Associations which they have the honor to represent. They believe also that it will be possible to maintain the significance of the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Science only by a universal agreement on the part of colleges in the United States to abstain wholly from conferring them *honoris causa*. As the representatives, therefore, of their respective Associations, they pray you, if the practice of giving these degrees *honoris causa* has arisen in the college under your control, that it shall by your authority from this time be discontinued.

JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE (*Chairman*), Harvard University; WILLIAM D. WHITNEY, Yale College; BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE, Johns Hopkins University; IRVING J. MANATT, Marietta College; CHARLES R. LANMAN, Harvard University.

*For the American Philological Association.*

GEORGE J. BRUSH (*Chairman*), Yale College; WILLIAM B. ROGERS, Mass. Institute of Technology; H. CARRINGTON BOLTON, Trinity College; F. A. P. BARNARD, Columbia College; J. P. LESLEY, University of Pennsylvania; F. W. CLARKE, University of Cincinnati.

*For the American Association for the Advancement of Science.*

MAY 10, 1882.

TABLE

Showing the manner of granting the Degree of Ph.D. by Seventy-nine Colleges during the years 1872-1879.

	In 1872		1873		1874		1875		1876		1877		1878		1879		Total.	
	ex.	hon.	ex.	hon.	ex.	hon.	ex.	hon.	ex.	hon.	ex.	hon.	ex.	hon.	ex.	hon.	ex.	hon.
The degree of Doctor of Philosophy was conferred . . . . .																		
By colleges (11 in number) conferring it only after examination ;	12	...	17	...	11	...	9	...	13	...	21	...	21	...	18	...	122	...
By colleges (55 in number) giving it only <i>honoris causa</i> ; . . .	...	5	...	13	...	12	...	13	...	20	...	17	...	20	...	28	...	128
By colleges (13 in number) conferring it both after examination and <i>honoris causa</i> . . .	2	...	8	...	...	...	3	...	5	...	8	...	11	...	16	...	53	...
Total.	...	2	...	4	...	3	...	6	...	6	...	2	...	12	...	7	...	42
After examination . .	14	...	25	...	11	...	12	...	18	...	29	...	32	...	34	...	175	...
<i>Honoris Causa</i> . . .	...	7	...	17	...	15	...	19	...	26	...	19	...	32	...	35	...	170

For the conduct of further possible correspondence in regard to the subject of the above Memorial, the Committee was continued another year.

The reading of papers was resumed.

## 2. The Semitic Personal Pronouns, by Professor C. H. Toy of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

The origin of most relational roots is unknown ; that is, we are not able to say whether they came into existence in an independent way, or were derived from other parts of speech. Various attempts at such derivation have been made : it has been supposed, for example, that certain of the Semitic pronouns and prepositions could be traced to verbs ; but nothing has come of these attempts, for which, indeed, there are now no sufficient data. We may, however, hope from an examination of the existing stems to reach the simplest primitive Semitic roots, a knowledge of which is in any case indispensable to inquiries into origin. On account of the original simple demonstrative character of all pronouns, it is better to treat them all together ; but for convenience's sake this paper will be confined to the personal pronouns. There seems to be no reason why the suffixes should be regarded as abbreviations of the separate pronouns, and I shall accordingly treat them as independent stems. The third person, as the clearest in form and probably the earliest, may properly be considered first.

*Third person.* First, the suffix-forms. In masc. sing. we have *hu* (Arab.), *hū* (Heb., Eth., Sab.), *sū* (Ass., Min.), *hī* (Aram.), *h* (Aram., Heb.), *ū* (Heb.), *hum* (Sab.) (?), *m* (Phen.) ; from which it appears that the ground-forms are *hu* or *su*, and *hi*, the *ū* and *ī* being mere euphonic lengthenings of *u* and *i*, and not the result of composition with or absorption of another letter. Vowel or consonant may be dropped, leaving *h* or *u* ; the latter, uniting with the final *a* of the noun-stem, produces *ā*. The demonstrative *m* (commonly appropriated to the plural) is sometimes added, and then, the *hu* being thrown away, remains as sing. masc.

sign. The *s*-stem probably preceded the *h*-stem. In the fem. sing. we need note only the forms *ha*, *hā*, *h*, *sa*, *sī*, and observe that while *i* occurs in both genders, *u* has here been assigned to masc., and *a* to fem.; but we shall see that *a* was also masc. The plural and dual are made by the addition of *m* and *n* to the sing.: plu. masc., *hum*, *hōmū*, *hūn*, *hēm*; fem., *hun.na*, *hōn*, *hēn*; dual, *humā*. The original plural ending is *mu* or *nu* for masc., and *nu* for fem.; to which was sometimes added a demonstrative *ma* or *na* for emphasis; in the dual appears *ma* instead of *mu*. Heb. and Aram. have *ē* for original *u*. There was no original difference of gender between *m* and *n*, nor were these at first signs of number. There is no distinction of cases, except in Ethiopic, in what appears to be a later formation.

The separate or isolated forms are manifestly built up from the suffix forms. In masc. sing. we find *hu.wa* (Arab.), with which are identical *hū'* (Heb.) and *hū* (Aram.); further, *hau* (Aram.) = *ha.wa*; then *sū* (Ass.) = *su.wa*, and *we'etū* (Eth.) out of *tu* and *wa* to which is added '*a*'. The feminine has the parallel forms *hi.ya*, *hī'*, *hī*, *hai* = *ha.ya*, *sī* = *sī.ya*, *ye'etī* = *ya'a.ti*. In addition to the *s*- and *h*-stems we find here forms in *t*, which may be regarded as the earliest, though it seems likely that the three once existed side by side. The *ha* also is seen to be masc. as well as fem.; there is no original distinction of gender between the vowels. The *wa* and *ya* are demonstratives, occurring in other combinations not infrequently; from which also it appears that there is no inherent distinction of gender between them. The plural forms are mostly identical with the suffixes. Aram. adds an *n*: masc., *hēnūn* = *hu.nu.n* for *hu.nu.na*; fem., *hēnēn*, from the same. Eth. has a double set of plurals: '*emūntū*', '*emāntū*', where well-known demonstratives are prefixed to the *tu*, and *we'etōmū*, *we'etōn*, where the *tu* is inflected like *hu* above.

*Second person.* Object-suffix (added to nouns and verbs): sing. masc., *ka*, *kā*, *k*; fem., *ki*, *kī*, *k*; plu. masc., *kum*, *kemū*, *kūn*, *kem*; fem., *kunna*, *ken*, *kēn*; dual, *kumā*. The stem is *ka*, *kī*, or *ku*, the three being originally equivalent; *m* and *n* as above.

Subject-suffix (added to verbs): sing. masc., *ta*, *tā*, *t*, *ka*; fem., *tī*, *t*, *kī*; plu. masc., *tum* (for *tu.mu*), *tūn* (for *tu.nu*), *tem* (for *tu.mu*), *kemū* (for *ku.mu*); fem., *tunna*, *tēn*, *ten*, *ken*; dual, *tumā*. The stem is prevalingly *t*, which acts like the *k* above. Ethiopic has *k* here as well as in object-suffix. There is no interchange here between *t* and *k*—they are originally distinct and independent stems; nor need we look for some compound form, as *ta.ka*, out of which both may have come. But why one language has chosen one, and others the other, does not appear.

Separate forms: made by prefixing *an* to the *t*-forms. The inflections are the same as those above described. The *an* is a common demonstrative.

*First person.* Object-suffix: sing., to nouns, *ya*, *ī*, *i*, where *ya* is the original, and the others probably come from its junction with the genitive case of the noun, as *malkī* from *malki.ya* (and the *i* is abbreviated from *ī*); to verbs, *nū*, *nī*, *n*, which seems to have no connection with *ya*; this latter is identical with the same stem in the third person; plural, *na*, *nā*, *nū*, *nī*, *n*, the vowels being mutually equivalent. This *n*-stem is found in the other persons, and abundantly elsewhere.

Subject-suffix: sing., *tu*, *tī*, *t*, *ku*, where the relation between *t* and *k* is the same as in the second person; plu., *na*, *nā*, *nū*, *n*, *nan*, where *i* does not appear (though it was probably once in use), and in one form (*nan*) the stem is doubled for emphasis.

Separate forms: sing., *ana*, *anā*, *anī*, *ānī*, *ēnō*, *anaku*, *ānōkī*; plu., *anū*, *ānū*, *naḥna*, *naḥnu*, *anahnu*, *anahni*, *ḥenan*. The base in the singular is *na*, *nī*; in the plural, *na*, *nu*; all three vowels were probably once in use for both numbers. In the singular this simple base has been strengthened sometimes by a prefix, and sometimes by a prefix and a postfix; the prefix is the demonstrative *a* (found elsewhere), which is lengthened into *ā*, and diphthongized into *ē* (in two cases the stem-vowel *ā* passes into *ō*, a change common in Hebrew and Aramaic); the postfix is *ku*, *kī*, identical with the suffix-form. The plural sometimes contents itself with the prefix *a*, using *nu* as stem; usually it adds the *k*, in the form of *h*, and then further strengthens by addition of *na*, *nī*, or *nu*. Several dialects in this case omit the prefix, and Aramaic, further omitting the stem *na*, makes compensation by doubling the added *na*, thus: *ḥenan* = *ḥenana*, for *na.ḥe.na*.

The personal pronouns are thus common demonstrative stems, employed in simple form for suffixes, and combined in various ways for the separate forms. These latter are built up on the suffixes, and seem, therefore, to have followed them historically. Inasmuch as the simple forms do not appear as separate or isolated pronouns, it is possible that the personal pronoun first appeared as a suffix; that is, existing demonstratives, meaning 'this,' 'that,' were attached to nouns and verbs, acquired a personal sense, and then, on being isolated, were formally strengthened. This, however, would amount to no more than saying that the pronominal forms were strengthened as the pronominal idea acquired greater consistency. The same thing seems to have happened with the ordinary demonstratives and relatives.

Originally there was no difference of gender, number, or case between the different stems; usage gradually established certain distinctions. The distinction of person also was of gradual growth. The *s*- and *h*-stems were appropriated to the third person as the one nearest to the general demonstrative. The second person as object (and in one dialect as subject) was expressed by the *k*-stems, as subject and isolated by the *t*-forms (which last survived in one dialect in the third also). To the first person were assigned the *n*- and *y*-stems as object, the *t*-forms (in one dialect the *k*) as subject, and the strengthened *n* as isolated. We can hardly hazard a guess as to the reasons which determined this distribution of stems. Nor can we infer, from the fact that these stems are all found in Indo-European, the original identity of this family and the Semitic.

### 3. Further Words as to Surds and Sonants, and the Law of Economy as a Phonetic Force, by Professor W. D. Whitney of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Professor Whitney reminded the Association that he had read papers on these two subjects at the meeting of 1877, which were printed in the Transactions for that year (issued in 1878); and he asked permission to add at the present time a few remarks upon certain later discussions of them. Though the subjects may seem quite separate and diverse, they will yet be found to have a near practical connection with one another.

First, as to the distinction of surd and sonant alphabetic sounds: a well-worn theme, of which many perhaps are weary, but which cannot well be let alone until false views are thoroughly eradicated. These, to be sure, are dying out, and may be expected to disappear in another generation; but they die hard.

Founded, as they seem in the main to be, upon the peculiar usages of a part of Germany, they are especially current in that country, though by no means restricted to it. In their grossest form they are statable thus: "a *b* (for example) differs from a *p* simply by being a weaker utterance;" and this definition is even yet widely current. Then again, "a *b* is especially a weaker utterance than a *p*; but it is also, at least sometimes, characterized by sonancy." Once more, "the usual and normal *b* is sonant, but it is also a weaker utterance, being related to *p* as a *lenis* to a *fortis*; and the characteristic of sonancy not infrequently disappears, leaving behind only a difference of force." This last is a rough statement of Sievers's latest view, as laid down in his *Grundzüge der Phonetik* (Leipzig, 1881; the work is an altered and extended second edition of his *Lautphysiologie*): it is proposed to be here examined and criticised.

Our speaking involves a great variety in the force of utterance applied, under varying conditions. There is the difference, in innumerable degrees, of louder from softer delivery; the difference, less unrestricted, of the more emphatic from the less emphatic parts of one and the same sentence; and the difference, yet more restricted but still noteworthy, between the accented and unaccented parts of one and the same word, and even of one and the same syllable. These differences depend upon voluntary changes in the energy of expiration, of that muscular action by which a current of air is driven through the larynx and mouth. To the degree of energy of expiration, in each particular case, the action of the interfering and shaping organs of utterance adapts itself; they assume just that amount of stiffness and resistant force which the force of expulsion demands, in order to the production of the right sound. If one blows very hard, one compresses the lips accordingly, to make a *p* or *b*; violent compression without a corresponding pressure from behind would be artificial, a useless affectation.

Here is a real and primary distinction in regard to force of utterance, affecting all the constituents of speech; in virtue of it, our *p*'s and our *b*'s alike, along with every other element of our utterance, are now *fortis* and now *lenis*. Our natural continuous speaking involves a constantly alternating *crescendo* and *diminuendo* of force. An emphatic word is strengthened in every part; an accented syllable has more stress than an unaccented. The added force is mainly perceptible in the vowels of the word or syllable; but it also extends to the consonant surroundings of an emphasized or accented vowel, just as it extends to both vowels and consonants in louder general utterance. Thus, for example, the accented *b* of *biped* is stronger than its unaccented *p*, especially if a heavy accent be laid upon the word. So also the consonant following a short accented vowel shares in the increased force of the latter, while one following a long accented vowel has the weaker quality of the unaccented syllable, since (as first pointed out by Mr. Sweet) a long vowel is a *diminuendo* utterance; and hence the *b* of *pebble* is stronger than the second *p* of *people*; and the initial *d* of such words as *doubt*, *dight*, *date*, *dote* is stronger than their final *t*.

But there is also another kind of difference of force which Sievers, to the detriment of his whole exposition of the subject, mixes up with this. To illustrate it, he has devised and describes (pp. 18-19) an ingenious bit of apparatus: a glass tube, namely, bent into the form of a U and partly filled with water, and having at one extremity a short rubber tube, the end of which is introduced into the mouth as far as behind the point of closure or approximation of the mouth-

organs by which any given pair of sounds, surd and sonant, is produced. If one utters upon this instrument a *p* and *b*, for example, one sees clearly that, with a given general force of expiration, the *p* depresses the column of water in the hither arm of the glass tube much more notably than the *b*. From this experiment Sievers teaches us to draw the conclusion that a *b* is in itself a weaker sound than a *p*—that a *b* is a *lenis* and a *p* a *fortis*.

It is, however, upon the least reflection evident that the difference here is only a secondary one, a mere result of the sonancy of the *b*. In uttering a sonant, one drives the air through a closed slit, formed by the stretched and approximated vocal chords; while in surd utterance no obstacle is interposed between the lung-bellows and the column of water in the tube. Just so, if one were to blow directly into a tube in the ordinary way, first with the orifice open, and then with an india-rubber membrane stretched tightly across it and slitted, he would find much more effort necessary to produce a given effect in the latter case than in the former. The result of the experiment, accurately reported, is then this: we see clearly that sonancy imparted to the current of breath so checks it or narrows it at one point that it has less pressure to exert at another; the muscular force is divided, a part going to produce the vibration of the vocal chords, and a part acting upon the organs of mute closure, and evoking from them a corresponding effort of resistance. There is nothing in it tending to show that a *b* is produced by a weaker effort than a *p*, or that, under circumstances, when both are contiguous to the same vowel, as in *biped* (or the *d* and *t* of *date*), the sonant may not be a stronger utterance than the *p*—and that, not only primarily, in virtue of the muscular effort involved, but even secondarily, as measured by the effect on the column of water.

It appears evident, therefore, that we have no right to give the name of *lenis* to a sonant, which is producible with any degree of effort, and may be made stronger than the corresponding surd in the same syllable without in the least altering or obscuring the distinctive character and relative value of the two, unless we carefully define the term *lenis* as having nothing to do with a less expenditure of effort in utterance, and apply to the latter some different name. The two kinds of *lenitas*, primary and secondary, have very different parts to play in the history of speech. As involving, by reason of its sonancy, a less degree of pressure at the lips, a *b* may break into a spirant more easily than a *p*, and this may be plausibly alleged as the reason why a sonant is in general less stable, when once generated, than a surd; but it does not in the least follow that a *b* is itself the product of a weakening action, or a *p* of a strengthening action; as between these, it is simply a question of adding or withdrawing the vibration of the vocal chords. In the German word *hieb*, for example, the final sonant is pronounced surd, because to the German organs (as to those of the ancient Sanskrit-speakers) it seems easier to stop the sonant vibration with the vowel, instead of prolonging it after the lip-closure; and the circumstances that the vowel is here long, and the following mute therefore (primarily) a *lenis*, and that the end of a word is the point above all others where in general a weakening action appears, do not in the least stand in the way of the effect. If we are to apply *fortis* and *lenis* to the secondary results of surdness and sonancy, we must call also the *h* of *ha* a *fortis*, and its *a* a *lenis*.

Further on in his work (p. 56), Sievers himself distinctly acknowledges that the *lenitas* of a *b* is solely a secondary consequence of its sonancy; but he labors

to belittle the importance of this difference, and involves himself, it appears to me, in certain unclearnesses and inconsistencies. The point of most consequence concerns the real character of those non-sonant sounds which in South German dialects have become substituted for the older Germanic *media*. In the present edition of his work, Sievers for the first time fully admits that the original and proper characteristic of both Indo-European and Germanic *media* is their sonancy, and that their surd utterance is a local corruption; but he finds no difficulty in supposing that, having been formerly sonant *lenes*, they have dropped the element of sonancy, and become *lenes* pure and simple. This however appears to be, on the contrary, an assumption of extreme difficulty. That the ordinary laws of *crescendo* and *diminuendo* effort, depending on emphasis and accent, should undergo momentary suspensions or violations from point to point in order that a single consonant sound may be distinguished by inferiority of force—that, for example, the accented *b* of *biped* should be weakened by a voluntary relaxation of effort below the degree of the unaccented *p*, and the *b* of *pebble* below the second *p* of *people*—has a most artificial and implausible aspect. Infinitely easier would it be to suppose that the original weakening action in the glottis had been in some way modified, so as to lose its sonantizing, without altogether losing its weakening, effect. Just this is the view of Brücke, who declares the South German weak *b* etc. to be whispered sounds—that is to say, sounds in whose utterance the vocal chords are not brought to full vibrating tension and closure, but, by being narrowed to the position of rustling, so obstruct still the stream of breath as to leave a chance to distinguish *b* from *p*, in that imperfect way in which it is distinguished in whispering. Sievers (p. 96) refers to the view, but bluntly pronounces it “false,” and accuses those who hold it of “thoughtlessly copying” it from Brücke. It is, however, far from deserving such contemptuous treatment, and Sievers’s attempts to refute it will hardly be pronounced satisfactory until he shall appear to appreciate more fully the general bearings of the case, and the great difficulties in the way of accepting his own opposing explanation. If the *b* of the South Germans were a mere weakened *p*, if the glottis were not involved in its utterance in some way that rendered sonancy impracticable, there would seem to be no reason why the despairing efforts one sometimes sees them make to utter an ordinary sonant *b* should so fail of success.

Sievers finally intimates (p. 96) that an unnecessary amount of zeal has been expended upon the discussion of this subject, and claims that it is a matter of indifference whether one speaks of surd *fortes* and *lenes*, or of strong and weak surds. He does not, however, consider that the contest began, and still in great part continues, against those who held and hold that “weakness” is the distinction of a *b* from a *p*; that he himself has only in this latest publication (in part, presumably, under pressure of criticism upon his former views) come so near to setting the matter upon its true basis; and that even his present view (besides the objections to which it has been shown above to be liable) is calculated to give aid and comfort to the holders of the old grossly erroneous opinions. It has been truly claimed that a false apprehension of the interchanges of surds and sonants as results of weakening and strengthening has worked more mischief in theoretic phonetics than any other single error. And its maleficent influence is not yet at an end, even in the mind of Sievers himself, as the second part of this paper will endeavor to show.



The conclusions arrived at in the former discussion of the law of economy as causing the phonetic changes of language were briefly these: 1. that the tendency to economy or convenience fully explained the great majority of such changes; 2. that no other law or tendency had been successfully shown to have anything to do with the matter; 3. that a true view of the forces concerned in the life of language and of their way of working appeared to suggest the possibility of no other; whence it was inferred; 4. that the residue of exceptional cases, not yet brought under the law, would in all probability, with the progress of phonetic science, be found to be also only results of its working. We have now to see whether any of these conclusions have been refuted by more recent investigation.

The subject of the causes of phonetic change it does not lie in Sievers's way to discuss with fulness; but he passes rapidly over it, intimating his opinions with sufficient clearness. After noticing (p. 196) the general reference of change to the law of economy, he directs attention to the numerous apparent exceptions — numerous enough when reviewed in detail, though extremely few when compared with the plain examples of the working of the law. And among them he includes the conversion of sonants to surds in the Germanic rotation of mutes! — a sufficient evidence, as intimated above, that too much stress has not yet been laid upon the fact that a sonant does not involve a weaker effort of utterance than a surd. Here, now, is the most important, or certainly the most often urged, apparent violation of the law, found to depend, after all, on an erroneous valuation of sounds: how many of the rest are to disappear in the same way we shall know better by and by. In view of such exceptions, Sievers pronounces the dogma that all phonetic change depends on the tendency to ease “decidedly false:” which is just about as far wrong on the one side as the dogma itself, *quâ* dogma, would be on the other. No one has the right to say that the tendency in question has explained everything; nor, again, that it will not some time explain everything: the question is still an undetermined one. Sievers also does not attempt to set up any other and rival principle. He points out that all sounds to which one is used are about equally easy, and only unaccustomed ones hard; he might have gone further, and said that the “strong” sounds are, if anything, easiest in isolation or in simplest combinations. He apparently fails to see that it is only the necessity of rapid transition from one position of utterance to another in continuous speaking which calls for a facilitation that issues in phonetic change — and that, in his processes of “spontaneous” change as well as the rest. He points out, justly enough, that all the initiatory essays of alteration are sporadic, individual, various; but he does not add that the only demonstrated (if not the only conceivable) general direction in which they should occur — and, yet more, in which they should secure imitation and general acceptance — is that of facilitation. To make a comparison of a kind now popular: these individual attempts at change are like the infinite slight variations of form and function among animals; while natural selection, by survival of the fittest, is shown in the ratification and adoption of those which make for convenience — a convenience which (as Sievers also sees) is of very relative character, varying everywhere with the habits of speech of different communities, and having intricacies which we are far from fully comprehending.

The same subject is treated by Delbrück, in his *Einleitung in das Sprachstudium* (p. 118 ff.), but after a fashion that calls for but brief notice from us, since

he does not take the trouble to discuss with seriousness any of the points involved. After stating in a general way what is claimed for the law of economy,<sup>1</sup> he brings against it, in the first place, the question whether, after all, we are authorized to assume that the tendency to ease plays such an exclusively dominating part in human society. This, however, no one has ever had any thought of assuming; the true question is whether, considering what we know of language as the instrumentality of communication and thought, and what we know of its mode of use, we can trace, or ought to be able to trace, in a certain department of its changes, the operation of any other tendency than that to ease. He goes on to suggest that, "on the contrary," the general endeavor would naturally be, when learning to speak, to imitate as closely as possible what one hears. But in this suggestion appears to be involved a curious misapprehension of the whole general question, which really involves as a premise what he here urges as an objection. What we are asking, namely, is this: when each generation learns to speak from its predecessors, and like them, having no intention to deviate from their speech, and no consciousness of doing so, how does it happen that the phonetic form of language is nevertheless all the time and everywhere changing? Then he further inquires (giving Benfey the credit of the hint) whether what is pleasing, quite as much as what is easy, might not be striven after (*erstrebt*). Certainly, if there were any "striving" at all in the case; but there is not; the whole is done in utter unconsciousness; no speaker is aware that his new way is easier, or even that it is a new way; he adopts it because it is easier, without knowing it. The tendency to ease is, as was said before, a hidden and insidious force, like gravitation, always pulling at what is above the surface, and drawing it down unless it be held up — the holding-up force in language being the imitation and retention of former modes of speech. To admit a tendency to what is pleasing would imply that the unreflective users of a language are aware of points in their utterance which they disapprove, and would fain amend — which, of course, is absurd. It would also imply a reversion to the old times of darkness, when "euphony" in language-history was supposed to lie in what pleased the ear, rather than in what is convenient to the organs of utterance. Delbrück thinks, then, that this tendency, along with others that might be conceived of (what they should be he does not go so far as to intimate), may perhaps work efficiently against the tendency to economy. Finally, he urges that the history of language shows numerous phenomena of change which are opposed to the assumed law, cases of strengthening instead of weakening. That is to say, he, like many others, is prepared already to pronounce all apparent exceptions forever irreconcilable with the law. But if ninety-nine hundredths, or even only nine tenths, of the phenomena fall plainly under it, while the remainder is diminishing with the improvement of phonetic science, and if no other concurrent law has been found, our true attitude at present would seem to be one of expectancy.

Delbrück's contribution to the discussion of the subject must be held, accordingly, to mark no advance in its comprehension, but rather in part a falling-back to points of view which might have been regarded as already left behind.

A few words, finally, as to a peculiar theory brought forward by Osthoff, at

<sup>1</sup> In part, in the words of the present writer; going back, however, to the latter's "Lectures" of 1867, while overlooking the later statements of his "Life and Growth of Language" of 1875, and his special and greatly expanded exposition of the subject, of 1878.

the Gera meeting, in 1878, of the German philologists and schoolmen.<sup>1</sup> This scholar, after maintaining that the laws of phonetic change work absolutely and without real exceptions (a dogma which is at least premature, and may perhaps be finally found undemonstrable), went on to determine the reason somewhat thus: the German rotation of mutes shows conversion of sonants to surds — that is (once more!), of weaker to stronger elements — as well as the contrary; hence, it is impossible to ascribe phonetic changes to economy; and we must assume that they are owing to physical alterations in the organs of utterance. That is to say, the old Germans said *that*, and the high Germans say *das*, instead of the original *tad*, because the muscular apparatus in their throats and mouths has in such a way grown different that the exertion which once made the one now makes one of the others! It is not well possible to conceive of anything more unfortunate, more at variance with the plainest truths of the science of language, than this. It ignores the fact that we all *learn* our modes of utterance, and that the infant, whether his ancestors have spoken French, English, or German, acquires with precisely the same ease either of those languages. It is the most striking recent exemplification of the fact that one may be an able and distinguished comparative philologist without being saved from falling into the most palpable errors in matters that concern the life and growth of language.

It may safely be claimed, then, that the discussion as to the law of economy remains where it was left by us five years ago: no one has succeeded in establishing any new law to stand by the side of this one; nor has any one, it is believed, changed essentially the aspect of any of the obstacles which were in the way of its universal acceptance. But the most formidable of these in effect is still, as formerly, the deeply-rooted error which regards the conversion of a surd to a sonant as the result of a weakening process.

The Association then adjourned until 8 P. M.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., Tuesday, July 11, 1882.

#### EVENING SESSION.

The Association was called to order in Sever Hall at a few minutes after 8 P. M. by the Vice-President, Professor M. W. Humphreys of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

The Annual Address was delivered by the President, Professor Frederic D. Allen of Harvard University.

#### 4. The University of Leyden in its relation to Classical Studies.

After speaking of the year just past, and the deaths of Professor Lyman Coleman, a member of the Association, Theodore Bergk, H. L. Ahrens, John Muir, and others, the President said that in the whole course of classical studies since Erasmus's time there might be easily discerned three turning-points, each marked

<sup>1</sup> The writer quotes from memory, having been present at that meeting; he has not had access to the complete publication of Osthoff's paper (as one of the *Wissenschaftliche Vorträge* series); and in the brief abstract of the Gera report this part of it is omitted.

by the appearance of a single man of pre-eminent genius; and that thus four periods might be distinguished. These men were Scaliger, Bentley, and Wolf. During two of these four periods, philological study centred in Leyden; hence the importance of this university for our studies.

It was especially fortunate for classical study, at the end of the sixteenth century, that the Dutch were able to take it up. The studies of the French, closely connected with the Huguenot movement, were coming to an end; there had been Budé, Turnèbe, Lambin, and later, Scaliger and Casaubon; but after them there was an immediate decline, as the influence of the Jesuits in the state prevailed. And in Germany and England the civil turmoils of the seventeenth century were necessarily unfavorable to all serious research. But classical studies found a refuge in Holland during the era of her material and intellectual greatness. The favorable conditions for philological study in Holland were pointed out — among them the absence of a national literature.

The foundation of the Leyden University, immediately after the memorable siege of 1574, was next described, and reasons given for its extraordinary prosperity. Leyden had the advantages which a fresh start, without hampering traditions, gave, at a time when the struggle between the new and the old educations — the classical and the scholastic, the “poets” and the “artists” — was not yet entirely ended. The number of foreign students was from the outset very large. The outer and inner appointments of the Academy were not in the least magnificent. There were eight professors at the beginning: throughout the next century the customary number was about twenty. The buildings were disused convents, most of the lectures being held, from 1581 on, in the old White-Nun Cloister, which was burned in 1614, and rebuilt without much change, and is now still in use.

There have usually been two chairs of instruction in classical literature at Leyden, called respectively those of “Greek” and “History,” — the latter meaning practically Latin literature; but a good deal of *Lehrfreiheit* prevailed. The Greek chair has often been occupied by a Latinist who took but a perfunctory interest in his department.

After mention of Tiara and Vulcanius, the first professors of Greek, Justus Lipsius was named as the first Leyden teacher (1579–1591) of far-reaching reputation and influence, and as representing admirably the main features of the philology of the coming century. These characteristics, which were dwelt on at some length, were given as follows: (1) Latin literature was almost exclusively cultivated; Greek was looked on as a far-off language, somewhat as Sanskrit now is, and was more neglected in the seventeenth century than it had been in the sixteenth; (2) text-criticism was altogether a matter of individual acumen and divinatory power; the importance of manuscript investigation was not realized; (3) the main strength of this age of scholarship lay in interpretation, especially in *material* interpretation — explanation of the things spoken of, the matters treated of; and in this field wonders were accomplished; (4) these were the first attempts at supplying systematic treatises on history, geography, antiquities, literature, etc., — crude beginnings, taking the form of monographs, mainly important as collections of passages. The speaker mentioned Lipsius's work in each of these departments, with especial praise of his editions of Tacitus, Velleius, and the two Senecas.

Scaliger's connection with Leyden was a superficial one, as he held only a sort

of honorary professorship without teaching duties (1593-1609), and he spent only the last years of his life at Leyden; nevertheless he was an important factor of Leyden's greatness. Two chief characteristics of Scaliger's scholarship were pointed out, his unexampled skill in conjectural criticism, and the breadth and catholicity of his learning: as examples of these two respectively were described his edition of Festus, and his work on Chronology.

The chief lights during the next half-century were Daniel Heinsius, who taught uninterruptedly for fifty years, and with him successively Meursius, Vossius, and Salmasius, Salmasius's professorship being, like Scaliger's, a sinecure. These men were briefly described, and other lesser scholars named. Heinsius owed his great popularity to his talent at verse-making, and his eloquence and enthusiasm as a teacher. The speaker gave examples of the shallowness and puerility of his critical procedure. Meursius, the Greek antiquarian, had great diligence and some constructive power, and his monographs laid a good foundation for subsequent work. Vossius was much more than a philologist and only a part of his voluminous writings concern us. Specimens from his "Etymologicum" of the Latin language are *damnum* from *δαπάνη*, *agua* from *ἀ-χρά*, 'pouring together,' *quatuor* from *χάτρερον*, 'and another,' etc. Salmasius, the last of the eminent French scholars, had little direct effect on Leyden philology, though his importance for science is considerable.

The time from 1655 (Heinsius's death) to 1741 comprises three generations: the first marked by J. F. Gronow, who ranks along with Lipsius as one of the two coryphaei of the Netherland Latinists. Gronow was a German by birth, a man of little brilliancy, and not in the least many-sided, but of solid learning and judgment, and one who exerted a steady influence in the direction of sound method. He did not a little work in the collation of manuscripts, though with nothing like the thoroughness which we now demand; yet one sees in him the beginnings of method in the diplomatic part of text-criticism. Other work of the same kind was done by his contemporary, Nicholas Heinsius, Daniel's son. But their example was not generally followed, and much of their knowledge died with them.

The next generation found at Leyden Jacob Gronow, son of the foregoing, and Jacob Voorbroek (Perizonius), who were succeeded in turn by Peter Burman the elder and Sigebert Havercamp. This era is remarkable for what we may call the cyclopaedic tendency, — a general striving to collect and mass together in big books the accumulated results of predecessors' labors, as if men had a feeling that there was to be a sort of winding up, and that philological activity was to be diverted into new channels. This found expression in two ways: first, in the vast collections of monographs, the chief of which are the "Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum," edited by Graevius at Utrecht, and the "Thesaurus Antiquitatum Graecarum" of Jacob Gronow at Leyden, and secondly, the numberless "variorum" editions, with the collected commentaries of foregoing editors, the two Burmans and Havercamp being the great representatives of this compilatory kind of learning. Oudendorp, who was contemporary with Hemsterhuis, was the last of this series of Latinists.

The year 1741 marked a turning-point, and the advent of Hemsterhuis signalized at Leyden the *Greek revival*, which had already begun elsewhere. The speaker traced this new movement back to somewhat obscure beginnings in Germany and England, without being able to state definitely its causes. Hem-

sterhuis was at any rate the first to bring Greek studies conspicuously into notice again, and may be called the restorer of Greek. The new Greek philology had these features in marked contrast with former studies in Greek: it concerned itself first of all with the writings of the older "classical" period, and very much with the distinguishing of Attic from non-Attic usage; and in general, minute linguistic criticism was its chosen field. So the Greek grammarians were zealously studied, as auxiliaries in this research. Hemsterhuis's immense influence was exerted mainly by word of mouth; his printed works are few in number; but in fifty years of oral teaching he founded a school of Hellenists that has lasted in unbroken continuity till the present day. The speaker mentioned also the theory of the Greek language which was taught in Holland in the last century, and the derivation, by "analogy," of all its words from root-verbs, ΕΠΩ, ΛΑΒΩ, and the like. This system is known to have originated with Hemsterhuis, though he never put it into print himself.

Hemsterhuis's most distinguished pupils were, in the first generation, Valckenaer and Ruhnken, and in the second Wytttenbach. All these worked on in the same spirit. Ruhnken's interesting personal career was touched on, and the scholarship and labors of Ruhnken and Valckenaer compared. The years during which these Hellenists were together at Leyden (1766-1785) were the last years of the European importance of Leyden for philology. As early as the death of Valckenaer the prestige of Holland in these studies was impaired. Other countries were awakening; in particular, Heyne at Göttingen had given a fresh impulse and brought philological study to the front in Germany, and Wolf was just beginning his career at Halle. So the leadership quietly slipped away from Leyden and from Holland. The foreign students rapidly fell away, and Leyden, from a European university, became what she is now, simply a Dutch university.

The succession of teachers during the present century was noticed, and the connection traced between the school of Hemsterhuis and the present circle of Dutch philologists, of which Cobet is the head. In conclusion a comparison was drawn between the German philology of the present day and the Dutch philology of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and besides other deficiencies of the latter, was noted the little sense for what the Germans call "higher criticism,"—the detection of interpolations and spurious writings.

The Association adjourned to 9 o'clock Wednesday morning.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., Wednesday, July 12, 1882.

#### MORNING SESSION.

The Association came to order at 9.30 A. M. The Secretary read the minutes of Tuesday's sessions, and they were approved. The reading of communications was then resumed.

5. The World of Beowulf, by Professor F. A. March of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

The world of Beowulf is a strange world. Its characters are strange; the action goes on in the midst of a strange nature. Some explanation of its strange-

ness was attempted by examining the manner in which its effects on the different senses are presented. The words were collected which show the effect of objects on the sight, then those which represent sounds, smell, taste, etc. The use of descriptives of sight is very abundant. It is the habit to give the color of objects. But upon collecting the words they are found to describe degrees of light and shade, rather than different qualities of color. Objects are described as bright, white, grey (beorht, blâc, blonden, brûn, scîr, torht, hâr, græg), or as dark, murky, swart, wan (deorc, myrce, sweart, wan), or the like. Of red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, violet, yellow is the only one that figures in this early world. Yellow is common. The ocean, the roads, the horses are yellow. It is the great expanse of a white and dark world in the far north, a monochromatic sketch of a world not yet tinted. Into the midst of this nature, however, man brings some specks of color. These are carefully described as fâh, variegated, — peculiarly colored. Furniture and arms wrought with gold are golde-fâh, or with jewels, sinc-fâh; and we have bân-fâh, brûn-fâh, stân-fâh — the roads are stân-fâh — but oftenest of all are objects blôd-fâh, dreor-fâh, swât-fâh, wael-fâh. The blithesome raven is black of course; and horses of the chiefs are glistening, *blanc*; in one splendid gift which Beowulf makes to his lord there are four horses of apple-yellow (*æppel-fealuwe*). In this pale land is found no breath of fragrance. There is but one mention of smell. A dragon is said to smell or follow the scent of his enemy's footprints. Nor are the flavors of taste distinguished. There are great feasts celebrated, but no solid food is mentioned. Beer, ale, wine, mead, *lith* and *wered* flow freely, but their taste is not described. Water is abundant, but it starts no suggestion of drinking. Cold and hot, hard and soft, occur.

But, perhaps, the most impressive fact relates to the descriptives of sound. So far as objects of nature are concerned, there are no such descriptives. The inanimate world utters no sounds. Men talk, laugh, two or three times; they weep, roar with pain or grief, sing, play the harp, sound the trumpet, rattle their armor, make a din. Three or four times objects associated with men are raised to animation and utterance. A weapon sings, the ship and the funeral pile of Beowulf roar, the black raven, blithe of heart, announces the rising of the sun. But the great world surrounding man is silent, — a soundless as well as a colorless world. In this world men, a few weak beings, live their life, standing by each other, and fighting monsters. No man harms any other man in this story. Beowulf risks his life over and over to help others, and this is his simple nature; not a religion, not a duty even, — a simple matter of course. He has no ambition; does not want to be a king, does not seek adventures. He was neglected and overslaughed in his youth because he was not enterprising. He is good-natured through and through, and serenely wise; loyal above all to the king and his children, and to Hygd, the young queen. The later romances would have been sure to make this Lancelot in love with this Guinevere. But Beowulf is not of that kind. He forms no ties. He is more like the lion of the romances who guards the Lady Una, and lives for nothing more than a touch of her hand. This type of character that likes to lie in the sun, but rises to any emergency, is a favorite with all mankind. He is not, however, presented with any elaboration of character. The poet seems only interested in the story he is telling, not in the development of the character of his hero.

There are some things in the poem which, in spite of its general rudeness and obscurity, suggest that the author had a cultured and even artificial love of the

picturesk. The opening of the poem is one of the most picturesk incidents to be found among the tales of erly man. The obsequies of the hero Scyld, by embark-ing him in his boat with his tresures and trofies, and his flag flying above him, and sending him out to sea to return whence he had come an infant, the story of Hiawatha, of the Kalewala, of Arthur and the rest, is the same in its picturesk effect as that of Tennyson's Ulysses.

No one can say who receivd the load,  
says the Beowulf.

It may be that he reacht the happy isles,  
And saw the great Achilles.

This beginning, so striking in itself, has a certain artificial aspect, because it is not a part of the following story, but relates to the ancestor of the heroes of it. The conclusion is also in the same picturesk manner. A monument is wrought over Beowulf with striking ceremonies, on a hill high and broad, and seen afar by seafaring men. Ten days they built it, the best of funeral piles, that far-seeing men might find it most honorable and becoming. The same manner is shown in many particular descriptions, as in that of the region in which Grendel had his lair. Striking details ar here givn simply for picturesk effect. The author knew something of the Bible. He mentions God, the devil, hevn, and hel, very much as men do now. He puts the Bible monsters on the same footing as those of his own mythology, just as Milton does. But there is no Christ or any special Christian thought in the book. Several passages suggest an acquaintance with Homer or Virgil. But if the author had taste to decorate parts of his poem, he had not sustaind vigor of imagination to bring the whole of his material into an epic unity.

## 6. A Bibliographico-critical Sketch of the Greek New Testaments published in America ; by Dr. Isaac H. Hall of Philadelphia, Pa.

Reasons exist, aside from mere curiosity, for an inquiry into the history and character of the Greek New Testament as published in America. These reasons mainly centre themselves in the varieties thus disclosed of the various representatives of the *textus receptus*, so called, and the habits of editors who have professed to issue it. The inquiry also discloses a generally unsuspected industry and enthusiasm of the early American editors. The whole ground, moreover, is new ; O'Callaghan's *American Bibles* enumerates only sixteen editions of the Greek Testament, a mere fraction of those issued previous to 1860.

After a short sketch of the early supply, accessible before the Greek New Testament was printed in America, the author discussed the American editions in families, taking them in the order of appearance of the first representative of each respectively, and noting the character of the text as compared with its archetype.

The first Greek book printed in America was (probably) the *Enchiridion* of Epictetus, with a Latin translation, published at Philadelphia by Mathew Carey in 1792.

The first Greek Testament issued in America belonged to the Mill family, and was published by Isaiah Thomas at Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1800. The



differences of text from those of Mill were such as to disclose an independent editorship, with Beza or a late Elzevir as the source of the variations, though the title states that the book is an accurate reprint of Mill. Its immediate pattern, as to form and sundry minor details, was probably a Bowyer edition (1794) that has escaped the bibliographers. Other editions of the Mill family are: one by Thomas, Boston, 1814; the American Polymicrian (edited by Joseph P. Engles), a reprint of Bagster's Greenfield's Polymicrian, with sundry corrections; Spencer's, New York, Harpers, 1847, etc.; and the American Bible Union's first series, 1854, etc.

The next family were the Leusdens, a branch of the Elzevir family. These included the two printed by Bradford, Philadelphia, 1806, and one by George Long, New York, 1821. Strong's *Harmony*, New York, 1854, etc., also presents an Elzevir text. These four books are the only American representatives of the *textus receptus*, and not perfect at that.

Next followed the Griesbach editions. First of these was the reprint of Griesbach's *Manual*, and most elaborate text, issued at Cambridge by the University Press (Wells and Hilliard), in 1809. Other editions are the Gospels of the same, Boston, 1825; Moses Stuart's edition of Newcome's *Harmony*, Andover, 1814; Kneeland's Greek and Greek-English, Philadelphia, 1822, 1823; and the notorious *Emphatic Diaglott*, edited by Benjamin Wilson, 1863-1864, etc.

Next to appear were the Stephanic editions. The first of these was that of Peter Wilson, Hartford, Cooke, 1822 (not 1808, as stated in Reuss's *Bibliotheca*), and often since by various publishers. This is professedly a reprint of the edition of Robert Stephanus; but an examination shows abundant marks of independent editorship. This was followed by a Greek-Latin edition, the Greek from the same stereotype plates, patched here and there to accommodate the Latin, and the whole furnished with Leusden's title-page; published by Collins and Hannay, New York, 1824. Though a stupendous sham, and not Leusden's at all, but belonging to an altogether different family, this edition has had the largest circulation of any Greek Testament ever published in America, and is still in print from the same plates, being now issued by a firm in Philadelphia. Another — and the best — representative of the Stephanic family is the reprint of Scrivener's *Manual*, by Holt, New York, 1879.

Next follow the Knapp editions, first represented by Robinson's edition of Newcome's *Harmony*, Andover, 1834, and then by Patton's *The Student's New Testament*, New York, 1835, etc.

Of other families are the Bloomfields, starting in Boston in 1837, and running through at least fourteen editions; the Hahns, beginning with Robinson's, 1842, etc.; Tischendorf, in Gardiner's *Harmony*, 1871, etc.; Scholz, in reprints or in imported sheets of Bagster's publications; and the various reprints of Ellicott's Epistles.

In treating of the several families an account was given, as far as necessary, of the foreign sources of each, in addition to the descriptive and critical information which formed the bulk of the paper.

After a few comments on the foreign supply, the paper closed with a chronological list of the Greek Testaments published in America, including Harmonies of the Gospels and other portions of the text. The number was about eighty editions of the entire New Testament, and about fifty which contained only a part thereof.

7. Alien Intrusion between Article and Noun in Greek, by Professor A. C. Merriam of Columbia College, New York.

In most languages only attributive words or phrases are admitted between the article and its noun, and so strictly does this obtain that it may be regarded as a law founded in the very nature of simple and unaffected language, while any violation is either poetic or due to poetic influence in a highly rhetorical and elevated style. It appears to be in obedience to its early moulding under poetic influence that ancient Greek admits alien words and clauses of all kinds, especially the verb, between article and noun, but under the strict application of a law which had not been heretofore formulated, to the knowledge of the writer, except for the genitive of the personal pronouns, the demonstratives, and *τις*.

The Law: The alien element is admitted only when an attributive also stands after the article, and this must normally precede the alien element; as, *ἴξε δ' ὅθ' ὁ κλυτὸς ἦεν Ἀχιλλεύς*, T 320.

Rare, outside of the Epos, and poetic is the order of M 462, cited by an anonymous rhetorician (Spengel, iii. p. 136), under *ὑπερβατὸν καθ' ὑπέρθεσιν*:

*ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἔκθορε παῖδιμος Ἐκτωρ.*

Prevalence: Homer; idiom in various stages of advancement; cf. Φ 518, Δ 75, γ 363, ζ 176, π 133, Η 403, μ 113, 428, κ 436, β 403, Ε 321, Ψ 585, τ 483, π 334, λ 452, Δ 608, δ 71. — Hesiod, Theog. 872 (?).

Gnomic and Lyric fragments (Anthologia Lyrica, Bergk, Teubner text): Tyrtaeus, one instance; Archil., 3; Simon. Am., 1; Solon, 2; Sappho, 2; Erinna, 2; Anacr., 4; Simon. Ceos, 8; Theognis, 11.

Pindar: 182 pp. (the page of the Teubner texts is the standard throughout), 52 cases, or 1 in 3½ pp. The adjunct regularly adheres to the article, but the inserted phrase may amount even to ten words, a characteristic feature.

Aeschylus: 257 pp., 84 cases, or 1 to 3 pp. The Prom. alone has 37 to 34 pp. Noticed and explained, Sept. 632, Prom. 289.

Sophocles: 347 pp., 237 cases, or 1 to 1½ pp. Noticeable is the prominence of the possessive as adjunct; 97 times, adj. 90.

Euripides: 763 pp., 436 cases, or 1 to 1¼ pp. Possessive, as in Soph. Separation of noun from adjunct generally limited to four or five words, as in Aesch. and Soph.

Aristophanes: Clouds and Frogs, 115 pp., 23 cases, or 1 to 5 pp. In many particulars nearer the prose of this period.

Herodotus: 720 pp., 109 cases, or 1 in 6½ pp.

Hippocrates: De Aere, one case.

Thucydides: First Bk., 97 pp., 11 cases, or 1 in 9 pp.; verb only 4 times.

Xenophon: Anab. first 4 Bks., 138 pp., 9 cases, or 1 in 15 pp.; verb thrice. Mem. 141 pp., 7 cases, or 1 in 20; verb 4 times.

Plato: Apol., Crito, Prot., Phaedr., Rep. first 3 Bks., 281 pp., 50 cases, 1 in 5½ pp.; verb 31 times.

Gorgias: Helen, none; Palamedes, 17 pp., 2 cases.

Alcidamas: Sophistes, 11 pp., 4 cases; all verbs.

Antiphon: 87 pp., 8 cases, 1 in 11 pp.; verb 5 times.

Andocides: 63 pp., 4 cases, 1 in 16 pp.; verb thrice.

Lysias: the first 11 genuine orations, 89 pp., 5 cases, 1 in 18 pp.; 3 verbs.

Isocrates: Paneg., Dem., Euag., 76 pp., 6 cases, 1 in 12½ pp.; all verbs.

Isaeus: first 3 orations, 48 pp., 4 cases, 1 in 12 pp.; verb once.

Demosthenes: Three Olynth., First Phil., De Cor., 117 pp., 49 cases, 1 in 2½ pp.; verb 32 times.

Aeschines: Adv. Ctes., 78 pp., 30 cases, or 1 in 2½ pp.; verb 20 times.

Lycurgus: Leocrates, 41 pp., 6 cases, 1 in 7 pp.; verb 5 times.

Aristotle: Rhet., first 20 pp., 5 cases, 1 in 4 pp.; 4 verbs.

Polybius: first 30 pp., 15 cases, 1 in 2 pp.; all verbs.

Apollodorus: 30 pp., 9 cases, 1 in 3½ pp.; all verbs.

Dion. Hal.: De Comp., 20 pp., 14 cases, 1 in 1¾ pp.; 13 verbs.

Longinus: 46 pp., 39 cases, 1 in 1½ pp.; 31 verbs.

Plutarch: Lycurg., 39 pp., 19 cases, 1 in 2 pp.; 16 verbs.

Lucian: first 190 pp., 45 cases, 1 in 4¾ pp.; verbs 8, *οὗτος* 19, *ἐκεῖνος* 10 times; verb but once in the five best pieces, a return to early Attic simplicity.

Arrian: Anab., first Bk., 2 cases; neither a verb.

New Testament: Epist. to Heb., *τις* once, verb twice; 1 Cor., none; Matth., *σοῦ* twice; John, none.

Exceptions to the Law: (1) the well known particles *μέν*, etc.; to the most of these this position belonged by right of immemorial occupation; the rest have gained it by enlisting under the same standard; even *ἔν*, Eur. Phoen. (Paley) 511, Hdt. iv. 130. (2) in Ionic Greek, the enclitic pronouns inserted without attributive force; as, B 217, Archil. 29, 97, Sappho 2, Erinna 6, Hippon. 62, Anacr. 81, Theognis 575, 813, 861, Hdt. *οἱ* 7 times, *μοί* twice, *σφί* thrice; cf. iii. 153, 74, i. 159, 166, vii. 160, i. 115, v. 46, Aesch. Prom. 289, Eur. Hip. 10; imitated sporadically in Attic; Plat. Phaedr. 236 D, Sympos. 177 A, Luc. Nigr. 2. With Hdt. iii. 65 (*ἐμῶν*), cf. Plat. Apol. 39 C. Similarly, the enclitic *τις*, 23 times in Hdt.; or if adjunct occurs, *τις* adheres to the article; as, i. 124, 187, 189, iii. 63. These Ionicisms are due to the strong gravitation of these pronouns towards the head of the clause in Hm. and Hdt., so as usually to assume the second or third position, especially after a conjunction.

The intrusion of the partitive genitive is almost entirely confined to cases where the participle or adjective is used without expressed subject, or the genitive forms a complex with an attributive word. In Hdt. i. 143, *αὐτῶν* is probably semi-reflexive.

Only apparent exceptions are the instances where an alien word or phrase appears within, but actually belonging to an extruded participle, adjective, or noun with which it forms a compound attributive; as, Thuc. iii. 56, Soph. O. C. 1514, Hdt. vii. 124.

If the verb is interposed between article and participle used without its noun, it must stand after one or more adjuncts of the participle; as, Hdt. i. 18, 103, vi. 75, vii. 111, 115, Aeschines iii. 31, 77. Similarly, if intruded between article and infinitive, it follows some adjunct of the latter; as, Soph. O. C. 769, Plato, Rep. 332 A, 339 C, 405 C; exception, Dem. Ol. ii. 3.

From the foregoing evidence the idiom is seen to originate in poetry and receive there its highest development, especially in the tragedians; Aristophanes, as in so much else, tends towards prose. Herodotus, dominated by the poets, almost meets Aristophanes; but the other early prose writers, both historians and orators, employ this hyperbaton charily, as becomes their simpler style. Demosthenes, in his earlier speeches, while still under the influence of the frugal

Isaeus, imitates his master's frugality; but in the full flow of his perfected rhetoric, in the Olynthiacs, Philippics, and De Corona, he surpasses even Pindar and Aeschylus in the richness of his usage, and in this he is rivaled by his opponent Aeschines, and even exceeded by Dionysius, by Longinus, by Plutarch, nay, by Polybius himself. In fact, for this later period, it had become a favorite artifice of language for all who made any pretence to rhetorical diction; when, however, we come close to the plain and natural language of the people, as in the Gospels and the Septuagint, we find the idiom has scarcely an existence, and the case is nearly the same in modern Greek.

8. The Eleventh Chapter of the First Book of Thucydides, by Professor Milton W. Humphreys of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

In this paper<sup>1</sup> were discussed, first, the expression μάχη ἐκράτησαν in § 1, and, secondly, the repetition of εἶλον in §§ 2-3.

I. It was proposed to read ἐκρατήθησαν for ἐκράτησαν.

(a.) If we retain ἐκράτησαν, the following difficulties present themselves:

1. Unless a reason for an event is cogent, a mere intimation of the reason is not allowable; whereas, in the present instance, the reason is not only not cogent, but is absolutely paradoxical.

2. As a fortification is needed more by a defeated army than a victorious one, the Greeks would have fortified before fighting, if they were going to fortify in case of victory. In this connection was discussed B 701-2.

3. The construction of entrenchments was merely incidental to their remaining in the country: if they could remain a single night, they could fortify. Why then should Thucydides single out this one evidence that the Greeks — *remained*?

4. The statement implies that a defeated army could not halt in the vicinity of the battle-field long enough to entrench itself; whereas Thucydides himself records instances of the contrary. Cf. v. 73, etc.

5. The emphatic οὐδ' ἐνταῦθα, 'not even under these circumstances,' just after mention of the supposed victory, implies that a victory would *naturally* have induced them to concentrate their forces, which is ridiculous.

6. As it was a war against a small city (B 122 ff.) and the object and confident expectation was the immediate conquest or destruction of Troy, it is absurd to suppose that the Greeks, after a victory, would halt to construct fortifications rather than press on to the city.

(b.) If on the other hand, we read ἐκρατήθησαν, all difficulties vanish.

1. The reason assigned for the conclusion that the Greeks were defeated is natural and satisfactory just as it stands, and is supported by H 337 ff., 436 ff.

2. The emphasis of οὐδ' ἐνταῦθα becomes quite appropriate.

3. The expression (μάχη) κρατηθῆναι is often used by Thucydides of a mere temporary defeat. Cf. vii. 49, 1; vii. 55, 2; vii. 60, 4, etc.

4. Krüger's objection that μάχη κρατοῦντες in § 2 refers to μάχη ἐκράτησαν in § 1 is strangely erroneous, as is shown below.

II. (a.) The difficulty which some commentators find with the repetition of εἶλον in §§ 1-2 is due to their overlooking the fact that two distinct modes of

<sup>1</sup> Published in full in the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. iii., no. 12.

capture are meant: first, by storm after a victory; secondly, by a siege, in case the Trojans declined a battle with the *entire* Greek army. It would be difficult to omit εἶλον in either place, without rendering the passage hopelessly obscure. Here Classen's explanation was criticised.

(b.) That μάχη κρατοῦντες does not refer to μάχη ἐκράτησαν in § 1, is shown by the following considerations:

1. The clause οἱ γε καὶ οὐχ ἄθροοι ἀλλὰ μέρει τῷ ἀεὶ παρατυχόντι ἀντεῖχον would be wholly superfluous.

2. The aor. part. κρατήσαντες would have been used (as in viii. 1, 3; vii. 11, 1) of so remote an event.

3. If we take μάχη κρατοῦντες in close connection with εἶλον, all is in order. The pres. part. is often employed to describe means, manner, or immediate circumstances, even of a specific occurrence; and especially common is this use of κρατῶν. Cf. i. 116, 2; ii. 91, 1 (impf. = aor.), etc. For a striking illustration, compare § 6 with § 7 of Paus. i. 13.

III. The paper closed with a paraphrase of the chapter, incorporating these views.

9. The Form and Force of the Aorist Tense in Greek, by the Rev. J. Colver Wightman of Taunton, Mass.

The object of this paper was to ascertain the original significance of the first aorist tense by a study of its genesis and by a comparison of its formal characteristics—its sibilant tense-sign and the augment in its indicative—with similar elements in Ancient Egyptian.

The Association adjourned at 12.30 P. M.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., Wednesday, July 12, 1882.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Association was called to order by the President, Professor Allen, at 2.20 P. M.

On motion, the Chair appointed a committee, consisting of Professors C. H. Toy, B. Perrin, and M. Warren, to nominate officers for the ensuing year.

On motion, Professors Van Benschoten, Tracy Peck, and Merriam were appointed a committee to recommend a suitable time and place for the next meeting, and the reading of papers was then resumed.

10. Notes on Latin Quantity, by Professor Tracy Peck of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

The object of the paper was to consider the frequent assertion that in the time of utterance of long and short vowels in Latin a strict ratio of two to one was observed. While it was admitted that this exact system is at the basis of

the poetry of the classical period, and that as an ideal it was sometimes striven for in rhythmical prose, it was maintained that there is no evidence that such a system was practically realized in the ordinary uses of the language.

An examination of the best verse showed that, at the end and in the body of all kinds of words, long vowels were often treated as short, and short vowels as long, and that by apocope or syncope such vowels frequently disappeared altogether. The habit of ascribing this free treatment to the effect of the metrical ictus or to poetic license was characterized as indolent and unsatisfactory. Statements in the best authorities show that hiatus was avoided in conversation as well as in poetry. Cases of synizesis, of the resolution of a diphthong into its elements, of the vocalization of consonants and the consonantization of vowels, were adduced in support of the doctrine of the paper. Reference was made to the fact that in words borrowed from the Greek, the Greek quantities were not always preserved in Latin. The fact that the Romans regarded short vowels in certain positions as either long or short, and the absence of separate characters for long and short vowels, must have affected the utterance of vowels not standing before a mute and a liquid. It was suggested that the music of much Latin verse must have been impaired if vowels naturally long, but followed by more than one consonant, were uttered differently from short vowels. Passages in the best ancient authorities on Latin usage caution against an over-fastidious counting off of syllables in pronunciation; and other passages, which allude to discussions among the educated Romans as to the proper length of many vowels, show that great latitude and inconsistency must have prevailed among the people themselves.

Remarks upon this paper were made by Professor Humphreys.

11. The Influence of the Latin Syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, by Professor W. B. Owen of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

The Anglo-Saxon Gospels were translated from the old Vulgate. The version is notable for its fidelity and care, and illustrates, even more than other translations in Anglo-Saxon literature, the influence of the Latin idiom upon the syntax of that language. The paper discussed and illustrated several points in which the conformity to the Latin is most plainly seen.

First, in the use of participles: noting these under heads suggested by the forms in the Authorized Version, we find participle used for co-ordinate clause, relativ, temporal, conditional clauses, for relativ clause plus its antecedent, for the infinitiv, as a noun, as an adjectiv, used objectively, used to make the progressive form. Nearly half the instances of the absolute construction found in Matthew and Mark are copied in the Anglo-Saxon. There is a considerable interval in these respects between the Gospels and contemporary prose not imitativ.

The same interval may be seen too in the frequent use of synthetic forms. The dativ object, the dativ instrumental, the dativ of manner, of time, of the possessor, of likenes, after comparativs, after verbs meaning *please, serve, command, believe*, etc., are a few of the constructions in which the influence of the Latin may be seen.

Prohibitions are expressed by a periphrastic imperative — ‘nillan’ with the infinitiv, in imitation of Latin *noli, nolite*. Conformity was also traced in the use of the infinitiv with subject accusativ, the use of the infinitiv to express the purpos

of motion,—the usual form being the gerund,—in making intransitive verbs transitive, and in various omissions and repetitions.

Several verbal turns were also referred to, resulting from the attempt to give an exact translation, such as 'and' translating *et* in its stronger meanings—"also, even;" 'wupon' for *injecerunt* in the passage, *illi manus injecerunt in eum*, where we might have expected 'legdon'; 'onwurpadh' for *objiciuntur*, a literal turn of the word but not a characteristic expression of the idea. So often with *mittere*, a word of wider ranges of meaning than 'sendan,' its literal equivalent, etc., etc.

With reference to the introduction of Latin words, it has often been noted that whereas other versions adopt terms from the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, it is a characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon to use native words, and, where words are wanting, to form home-made compounds. It is in the arrangement of words, the syntactical forms, and idiomatic phrases, that the influence of the Latin is mainly seen.

## 12. The Locutions "Two first" and "First two," by Professor F. A. March of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

When several attributive adjectives precede a substantive, each prior adjective commonly describes or defines the complex notion expressed by the substantive and intervening adjectives. Descriptive adjectives denoting qualities residing in the object are more closely related to it than definitives, which give the number, quantity, position, or other relations of the object. Descriptives are placed nearer the substantive than definitives. We say "two yellow flowers," not "yellow two flowers." The common order of thought is to combine the quality yellow with the flowers, then *two* enumerates the complex objects, *yellow flowers*. When two descriptives or two definitives are used, the same principle generally determines their order. A class is made by combining one of the attributives with the substantive, and this class is further distinguished or defined by prefixing the other attributive.

We often make classes upon a cardinal number. We divide objects into *twos* or *threes*. If we enumerate these pairs or triplets, the ordinal is put first. We say "the first two, the second two, etc.," þā forman twā monna cynnes, the first pair of mankind, Caed. 12, 31; on þæm ðætrum þrim dagum, in the second three days, Orosius, 1, 1, 13; first six, Spenser, Shep. Cal. August, first of a succession of sixes; the last hundred years, Trench, Eng. P. and P., 55. So we say "the first twenty-four hours," i. e. the first day. We speak of "the first ones," "the three first ones," but not the "first three ones."

We sometimes make classes characterized by an ordinal number. Books may be classified as first volumes, second volumes, and the like. Each college class has its first man. In parliament a class of speeches are called first speeches. "The best first speech that ever yet was made," Byron, D. Juan, 13, 90. In enumerating objects so classified the cardinal must precede the ordinal. "Send me two first volumes of Maetzner" must be written, if one wants two copies of that volume.

We may also make a class of first objects from a single series; *first*, besides its definite denotation in counting, also has an indefinite denotation like other superlatives. We call a number of objects *first*, which are at and near the beginning of a series. We say "four of the first years of a man's life" as we do "four of the ablest men." And so, including the whole of such a class, we say "the four first years," "the four ablest men," not "the ablest four men."

But often classes may be made either way. A preacher may divide his hymn into first verses and last verses, and say "sing two of the first verses," or "the two first verses;" or he may classify them by twos, and say "sing the first two and the last two verses." Nothing calls for one classification more than the other. In such cases is there any idiomatic habit which, in the absence of preference and reflection, leads to the use of one order rather than another?

I. The most far-reaching influence of this kind is the grammatical form of *first* and *last*. They are superlatives, and superlatives are prevailingly descriptives and attach themselves closely to their nouns. This leads to a prevailing use of *two first*, *two last*, and the like. Thus in our lighter literature may be found: forty last years of his life, Addison, Works, 2, 283; two first, two last, same on Milton, 13, 14; the three first Dutch governors, Irving, Knickerbocker, N. York, 36, and Life, 1, 204, 138; two last nights, Fielding, Tom Jones, 277; two last speeches, Goldsmith, Vicar of Wakefield, 14, ch. v.; two first, Thackeray, Lect. 313; five last, same, 281; two last centuries, A. Trollope, B. Towers, ch. 22; two first, Hughes, Tom Brown at Oxford, 1, 139; two first cantos, H. Lytton Bulwer, Life of Byron, xix; three first, Clelia, 2, 59; two first, Sterne, Sent. Journ., 9; two last hours, Richardson, Clarissa, 1250; two first dances, Miss Austen, Pride and Prejudice, 1, 96; two first volumes, Gil Blas, Trans., 320; two eldest, Miss Evans, Mill on the Floss, 53; Don Quixote, Trans., 210.

From poets also, Thomas Phaer in 1558 publishes a book entitled The Seven First Bookes of the Eneidos of Virgill, and in 1562, The Nyne First Bookes. Shakespeare has two latter, Pericles, 5, 3; Milton, the two last years of Honorius, Prose Works, 2, 247; Cowper, the three or four first years, Southey's Life, 1, 17; Byron, the four first rhymes, D. Juan, 1, 222; the two last, Life, xv; D. Juan, 1, 217, and to Murray on D. Juan, Cant. II.; so J. G. Percival, Life, 487; Warton on Pope, 1, 132, 272, 359, 414. And from historians, Sir John Mandeville, if he may pass for a historian, has "the two best cities," 258; Hume, the two last books, Hist. Eng., 3, 348; Lingard, the six first centuries, Ang. Sax. Church, 1, 379; Macaulay, six first kings, Hist. Eng. 1, 14; 5, 107; Prescott, two last, Phil. II., 2, 352; Motley, two first, D. R. 1, 240; Tacitus, two former, Trans. Hist., 5, 12; Froude, two first, Hist. Eng., 7, 43; 3, 193; few last years, 1, 193; two last, 2, 97; three last, 4, 110; Bancroft, Hist. U. S., 6, preface; Carlyle, T. Fred. II., 2, 382.

The following are references to essayists: Cotton, Translation of Montaigne, 57; Todd's Life of Milton; Burke, Works, 2, 2; 4, 56; 2, 58; 3, 210; Teignmouth, Life of Sir Wm. Jones, 2, 189; Halliwell, Fairy Myth, 229; Nursery R. 181; Wright, Thos., Lyrics Temp. Ed. I., V.; Masson, Milton, 2, 539; Craik, three last great sunbursts, Eng. Lit., 2, 453; Blair's Rhet., 38; Spedding's Bacon, eight last books, 2, 555, and often; Collins, Aristophanes; Morley, English writers, 1, 173; Schlegel, Dram. Lit., Trans., 82; Mandeville, Fable of Bees, Craik, 2, 256; E. Everett, on Byron, in Allibone; Carlyle, J. A., Dante, 15; J. Warton, in Todd's Milton, 3, 370; Warton's Pope, 2, 289; Walton's Lives, 157.

Here are some references to philosophers: D. Stewart, works, 2, 269; 2, 286; 3, 360, and often; Wm. Hamilton, Lect., 450; Bacon, 1, 77; Berkeley, Principles of H. K., Introduction; three last, Hartley, on Man, 18; Tucker, Light of N., 1, 136; Morell, 447; Chalybaeus, Trans., 334; Butler's Analogy, 1, 5; Whately Rhet., 270; Herbert Spencer, Psy., 261; Whewell, Phil. Ind. Sc., 2, 73; Aristotle, Organon, Trans., 1, 191.



II. This general analogy is often overcome by a large cardinal. Thus Burke, who has "two first," has "last forty," 3, 112; and Dugald Stewart changes to "first nine," "first seven," 2, 27; 358.

III. It is also overweighed by the habit of making frequent groups on particular cardinals. Our system of numbers makes frequent groups of tens, hundreds, and the like. So sevens have always bin frequent groups. "The first ten," "the first seven," are therefore prevailing expressions.

IV. In extemporaneous speech the order of words is often determined by the order of thought. A preacher, giving out a hymn, may have determined to give out some first verses, but not determined how many. He will then say: "sing the first [after making up his mind] two verses."

V. Personal habits as to precision and other matters easily outweigh the grammatical analogy. Mathematicians and logicians and other very precise men prefer idioms in which the most precise meanings are used; they do not like to speak of more than one first or last object. Some of them do, however. Day's *Algebra*, 183, and often, speaks of the *two first couplets*; so Davies's *Analyt. Geom.*, 322; 341; and Sir W. R. Hamilton's *Quaternions*, 75 and elsewhere. Wedgwood, also known as a filologist, entitles one of his books "The Geometry of the Three First Books of Euclid." So in Mansell, *Prol. Logica*, 95; and old Pecock (Marsh, *E. L.*, 476), "of the whiche thre proposiciouns the two first ben clepid premissis."

The scientists are next in this kind of precision, but "two first," "two last," are frequent in Darwin, *Species*, 222; *Domest.*, 1, 327, 328, 329; on *Man*, 1, 170; so Agassiz, *Classification*, 107; 127; two first fingers, Wallace, *Malay Archipel.* 144.

The lawyers: the order "two first" is found in Bacon, 1, 77; 4, 15, v.; Blackstone, 1, 240; Wheaton, *Laws of N.*, 496; Elliott's *Debates*, Va., 6; Th. Jefferson, Elliott's *Deb.*, Va., 3, 4.

The filologists might be expected to be very precise, but their familiarity with grammatical analogies inclines them strongly to "two first," "two last." We find these in Bopp, *Comp. Gram.*, Trans., 1, 202; two last vulgarisms, Bartlett, *Americanisms*, under *ought*; Bullions, *Eng. Gram.*, 59; Crosby, *Gk. Gram.*, 429; Ellis, *Early Eng. Pronunciation*, often; Evans, on *Versification*, 135 and often; Gibbs, *Teutonic Etym.*, 3; 79; 80; Guest, *Eng. Rhythms*, 1, 14, 15; 354; Head, *Shall and Will*, 14; 69; Hodgson, in Bunsen, 1, 136; Knapp, *Eng. Roots*, 109; Mitford, *Harmony of Lang.*, 10; Max Müller, *Sc. of Lang.*, 179; 237 and elsewhere; Pickbourne, *Eng. Verb.*, 18; Rask, *Thorpe's Trans.*, 27; Skeat, *Etym. Dict.*, under *andiron*; Thorpe, *Caedm.*, iv.; Vernon, *Ang. Sax. Guide*, 27; two latter, *Versetegan*, *Restitution*, 172; Wilkins, *Nat. Gram.*, 308 and often; Wilson, *Mahabhb.* v; Sansk. *Gram.*, 388; Hind. *Theater*, 1, lix; Whitney, *Language and Study*, 92; 133; 191.

Proof-readers incline to the definit form. They easily apprehend that there can be but one first.

Preachers exert the greatest influence on this idiom, because they use it so often before imitative audiences in giving out hymns, and the like. As this is a definit numerical announcement it naturally inclines them to the definit idiom. But those who choose to say "two first verses" may support themselves by the authority of Isaac Watts and many other good men, as well as our English Bible.

"I have not confined myself here to the sense of the Psalmist, but have taken occasion, from the *three first* verses, to write a short hymn on the Government of the Tongue." I. Watts, note to Psalm 39; "One thing needful, or serious meditations upon the *four last* things," Bunyan, title of a poem; Alford's Testament, 3 First Gospels, title; Thornwell, on Truth, 199, 200; Moses Stuart, on Romans, 347; Bishop Hall, in Warton's Spenser, 1, 187; Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 83; Ælfric's Homilies, 1, 270, þā *breð forman* gebêdu, the *three first* prayers; *seven last* (plagues), English Bible, Rev. xx. 1, xxi. 9.

And finally there is one great authority for the Queen's English, the Queen herself. She says, in her Life in the Highlands, 46, "I read to Albert the *three first* cantos of the Lay of the Last Minstrel."

### 13. On Surds and Sonants, by Professor March.

If a sonant is emfazed, magnified for examination, we hear a voice murmur with it, or in whispering, a whisper rustl, *ũbđ, đbũ, abũba*.

If a surd is treated in the same way we hear an *h* with it, *p-hđ*.

English-speaking men use much murmur breth, and our fonetists incline to emfaze it and judge all consonants by its presence or absence.

Germans, on the contrary, use littl sonant breth and much aspirate. This is a most important peculiarity, the race trait which givs rise to the peculiar changes in Grimm's law. (See *American Philological Association Transactions*, vol. for 1873, pp. 101 ff.) The aspirate sounds ar with them the most prominent, and they study their positiv qualities and incline to judge all consonants by the presence or absence of aspiration.

Aspiration being understood to mean the peculiar sounds of breth blown thru open vowel cords, the German and English judgments amount to the same thing in clear and distinct articulations, but some obscure and weak sounds the English might call surds because no murmur can be herd with them, and the Germans call weak, i. e. sonant, because no aspiration is herd with them.

It is to be wisht that we coud clearly set forth the vibrations of air which strike the ear and produce sounds, that we had some fonograf to study them by.

Take *p* and *b*. They hav different vibrations produced at the vocal cords. But these vibrations in the breth at the vocal cords ar combined at the ear with new vibrations produced in its passing thru the mouth, and the distinctiv caracter of *b* resides in vibrations caused at the lips. It may be givn to common vowel sound as well as to murmur. Ar the added vibrations from mouth and lips the same for *b* and *p*?

The closed vocal cords for *b* make a different sound from open cords, not only by vibrating, but also by changing the quantity and direction of the currents of breth, and so changing the rustls made in the mouth. The upper organs adjust themselves to this difference of currents by slight changes in their form and tension, which sensibly affect their vibrations. Whether these differences ar of any practical importance in the classification and description of consonants is a question. They ar interesting to experimenters in fonology.

In making experiments it is desirabl to use the familiar fact that the sound made in closing to a mute is different from that made in opening from one, e. g. not to identify the sonancy of closing *b* in *ab* with the opening to a following murmur. The organs often cloze sonant and open surd, as in some German final sonants, and in dissimilated gemination, where the opening from a sonant is

made surd by assimilation with a following letter, as where the opening from *m* is changed to *p* by a following *t*, A. Sax. *emtig* becoming *empty*, *Northampton*, *Northampton*; cf. also *simper*, *imp*, *into*, *sent*, and Sanskrit *bh*, *dh*, etc. (See *American Philological Association Transactions*, vol. for 1877, p. 151.)

Experiments on surds and sonants with inspired breath are interesting, and with whisper. Explain, for example, the sonancy of inspired whisper *bā*, *dā*, *gā*.

The hour of four having arrived, about forty members of the Association, and several of their friends, proceeded in open carriages to the residence of Colonel Theodore Lyman in Brookline. The route was from the College Yard across the Brighton Bridge over the Charles to Allston, Longwood, and Brookline Centre, by High street over the hill to Jamaica Pond, and then through Rockwood and Warren streets to Mr. Lyman's home. Here the party was most kindly received and entertained by Mr. and Mrs. Lyman. The company took leave a little before dusk. Returning by way of Heath street, Chestnut Hill Reservoir, and Brighton Market, over the Charles by the Abattoir, and then between Mt. Auburn and the river, they reached the College at dark.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., Thursday, July 13, 1882.

#### MORNING SESSION.

The Vice-President, Professor Humphreys, called the Association to order at 9.15 A. M.

The minutes of Wednesday's sessions were read and accepted.

Remarks upon Professor March's paper (no. 13) were made by Professor Samuel Porter of the National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.

The reading of communications was resumed.

14. The Ablaut in English, by Dr. B. W. Wells, Friends' School, Providence, R. I.; read, in the author's absence, by Professor W. B. Owen.

The paper showed the origin and structure of the old Germanic ablaut and its development in Old English. Then, taking the Old English for a foundation, it traced the gradual decay of the ablaut in Middle and New English, and showed how the remnants of the ablaut manifested themselves, and under what conditions.

There were four classes of strong verbs in Old Germanic, the ablaut in each being as follows:

- |      |     |                          |
|------|-----|--------------------------|
| I.   | e,  | a, schwa (or vanishing); |
| II.  | ei, | ai, i;                   |
| III. | eu, | au, u;                   |
| IV.  | a,  | ō, a.                    |

In New English a fifth class was added, consisting of verbs which formed the preterit by reduplication in Old Germanic. The nature of the root-vowel fixed absolutely the class of ablaut.

In Old English the same laws that modified the vowels in other cases acted on the ablaut and so produced some variety, while the general lines were strictly adhered to. The ablaut here was :

I. a.	e,	ae,	āē,	e;
I. b.	e,	ae,	āē,	o;
I. c.	e,	éa,	u,	o; or, before nasals,
	i,	a,	u,	u;
II.	ī,	ā,	i;	
III.	ēo,	ēa,	u;	
IV.	a,	ō,	æ;	
V.	Various vowels in the present and the past formed with ē or eo, with some relics of reduplication.			

Excluding class V., there were in Old English 255 strong verbs, of which 167 were Old Germanic, 49 West Germanic, and 39 found only in Old English. These data were compared with those for Old High German, which has 237 strong verbs, of which 150 are Old Germanic and 52 West Germanic, while 35 are peculiar to the Old High German. In Gothic there are 138 strong verbs, of which 107 are Old Germanic, 2 East Germanic, and 19 peculiar to the Gothic. Old Norse has about 200 strong verbs.

In Middle English the influence of the Old Norse through the Danish invasion led to giving up the ablaut, wholly or partially, in many cases. Many verbs also became obsolete in this time; but Middle English shows only the beginning of a process which at the present time is nearly completed; for in New English there remain of the Old English 311 strong verbs (including class V.) only 153; and of these 80 are weak.

The weak verbs are those which in Old English had *r* + consonant, *l* + consonant, *m* + consonant, *g*, or *w* after the root-vowel. While after *r*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *n* + consonant, *s* and *c*, we have usually strong forms. Further, verbs which had *i*, *ie*, *eo*, *ī*, in the Old English present, are strong in New English, unless disturbed by the consonants mentioned above; while those which had *a*, *ā*, *ō*, *u*, *ū*, *eo*, or *āē*, are weak, unless followed by the consonants last mentioned.

When the ablaut is retained each member is phonetically derived from the corresponding Old English form, unless there be some good ground for deviation, in order to avoid confusion. Owing to the variety in the ablaut which the Old English phonetic laws produced, and the still greater variety produced by the New English laws acting on these already diversified forms, no classification in New English can have more than an historic value.

15. On οὐ μὴ with the Future in Prohibitions, by Professor C. D. Morris of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; read, in the author's absence, by Professor Minton Warren.

It was assumed in this paper that the two οὐ μὴ constructions need not be explained in the same manner. The ordinary account of the use of the double negative in denials, that there is an ellipsis of some expression of *fear* between

the two, was accepted as sufficiently probable from the fact that such word of *fear* is not seldom actually found, and found even in cases where the notion of *fear* can be used only ironically; i. e. where it might be said that the notion not of *fear* but of *hope* was the one required by the context. Cf. Plat. Apol. 23 b: ἂ δὴ πολλοὺς καὶ ἄλλους καὶ ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας ἥρηνεν, οἶμαι δὲ καὶ αἰρήσειν· οὐδὲν δὲ δεῶν μὴ ἐν ἐμοὶ στῇ, 'the rule is in no danger of breaking down in my case.'

But it is a serious error to attempt, as Kühner does, to explain οὐ μὴ in prohibitions in this manner. His confusion is so great that he actually quotes Eur. Hipp. 606 οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα μηδ' ἄψει πέπλων as an example both of denial and of prohibition. Nor again is it consistent with a belief in the original difference of the two negatives to adopt Elmsley's explanation, e. g., of οὐ μὴ λαλήσεις, as if it were equivalent to 'will you not not-talk;' and the same consideration forbids us to suppose, with Professor Goodwin, that the μὴ merely reinforces the οὐ so that the two have the weight of a strong single negative in both constructions.

We get a hint at a more satisfactory explanation of the construction in question by considering such a line as Soph. Ai. 75 (Dind.) οὐ σῖγ' ἀνέξει μηδὲ δειλίαν ἀρεῖ; The effect of this is: 'hold thy peace, and do not exhibit cowardice.' We have here two commands, the first positive, the second negative. The positive command is conveyed by the use of οὐ with the future taken interrogatively; and in this part of the line there can be no question about the interrogative character of it; for otherwise, instead of being a command to do something, it would assert that the thing desired will not come to pass. It is a recognized use of the 2nd person of the future to convey a command to do a thing, whether stated affirmatively, as in Ar. Nub. 1352 πάντως δὲ τοῦτο δράσεις, or stated interrogatively with οὐ, as οὐ τοῦτο δράσεις; In the latter case the negative οὐ has its regular force in asking questions; i. e., like the Latin *nonne*, anticipating an affirmative answer.

As then the former half of our line is explained perfectly by the regular use of οὐ with the 2nd person of the future taken interrogatively, why may not the second part also be explained in a corresponding manner? As οὐ in questions expects an affirmative reply, so μὴ expects a negative one. Aesch. P. V. 962: μὴ τι σοι δοκῶ ταρβεῖν; Xen. Mem. iv. 2, 10, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀρχιτέκτων βούλει γενέσθαι; where the expected answer is given, οὐκ οὐν ἔγωγ', ἔφη. Interpreting the second half of the line on this principle, μηδὲ δειλίαν ἀρεῖ; will be 'and *will* you exhibit cowardice?' the prohibition being contained in the circumstance that the speaker asks a question about a fact, the existence or continuance of which she deprecates, in a form which shows that she expects an answer declaring that the state of things objected to shall cease or not exist.

It is true that such expressions as μηδὲ δειλίαν ἀρεῖ, following a question with οὐ, are usually treated as if their explanation depended on the supposed previous existence of such phrases as οὐ μὴ ληρήσεις. The force of the οὐ, for example, before σῖγ' ἀνέξει is assumed in some way to hold over, so that after it has served to give to the former clause its indispensable negative, it has still some negative force left to supply an imagined want in the latter half of the line. But why, if this force of the negative οὐ is needed in the second member of such lines, is the negative itself never repeated, the prohibition being always introduced with καὶ μὴ or μηδέ? And yet the repetition of οὐ would, in many at least of the instances, have been quite easy. Why, in this case for example, might not Sophocles

have written οὐδὲ μὴ δειλὸς φανεῖ? So in O. T. 637 Sophocles might have written κοῦ μὴ as well as καὶ μὴ, and would, one may suppose, have done so, if he had felt that οὐ had anything to do with the prohibition.

It being shown that the notion of a prohibitive command may have connected itself naturally with μὴ and the future, and that the presence of an οὐ accompanying this μὴ is not essential to the prohibitive force of it, what is to be said about those cases where οὐ μὴ are used together with the future in a sense substantially the same? For example: Ar. Nub. 367: ποῖος Ζεὺς; οὐ μὴ ληρήσεις· οὐδ' ἔστι Ζεὺς. τί λέγεις σὺ; Leaving out of view for the moment the question of punctuation, in regard to which Dindorf exhibits great inconsistency, and which is of comparatively slight importance,—as the matter now discussed is only the origin of the expression and not the way in which it affected the consciousness of those who used or heard it,—what are we to say about the presence of the οὐ? It has been shown that μὴ ληρήσεις ought to be able, on the recognized principles of the interrogative sentence, to convey the notion of a prohibition, and it appears in sentences like that quoted from the Aias to have this meaning. May not the οὐ be regarded in this construction as what Professor Gildersleeve has called it in another connection, a 'free' negative, i. e. one which, like our 'nay,' merely indicates that the attitude of the speaker's mind in regard to what has been said or proposed is one of negation.<sup>1</sup> The assumption of a 'free' οὐκ, with the implication suggested, is in accordance with the actual usage of the combination in question. For though the books are silent as to any limitation in the use of οὐ μὴ with the future as a form of prohibition, an examination of the passages where it occurs will show that it is employed only where the command is to break off and discontinue an action already begun or at least threatened; and the οὐ, which precedes the really prohibitive phrase, seems intended to deny the fitness under the circumstances of an existing state of things, as if it were οὐ πρέπει τοῦτο, οὐ χρὴ τοῦτο ποιεῖν. Two or three instances will elucidate this. In Ar. Nub. 297 (Dind.) οὐ μὴ σκώψει μηδὲ ποιήσεις ἅπερ οἱ τρυγοδαίμονες οὔτοι comes in with great propriety to stop the buffoonery of Strepsiades, who had just described his feelings in a way that threatened results which would interfere sadly with the decorum of the school. So in l. 367 of the same play οὐ μὴ ληρήσεις comes in just in time to cut short the simple confession of the old faith which Strepsiades had begun. In Ran. 200 Charon gives explicit directions to Dionysus where he is to sit, how he is to use his arms, etc.; but the god is evidently a wilful bungler, and accordingly Charon says to him οὐ μὴ φλυαρήσεις ἔχων. In Soph. Trach. 971 Hyllus enters and sees his father lying apparently dead, and begins to make loud lamentations. The old servant says: σίγα, τέκνον, μὴ κινήσης ἀγρίαν ὀδύνην πατρὸς ὠμόφρονος. And when Hyllus begins again to speak the servant interrupts him with: οὐ μὴ ἑξεγερεῖς τὸν ἕννυφόν· κάτοχον. There is one passage in which οὐ μὴ with the future appears not to have the required force. In Eur. El. 383 we find οὐ μὴ φρονήσῃ οἱ κενῶν δοξασμάτων πλήρεις πλανᾶσθε. It occurs in a speech of Orestes in which he protests against the popular criteria of a man's merit—wealth, birth, military prowess, etc. It is

<sup>1</sup> Since the reading of this paper Professor Gildersleeve pointed out to the writer a note in his edition of Justin Martyr to this effect: "Perhaps it may be best to consider οὐ as 'nay,' and μὴ as an interrogative expecting a negative answer." This is of course a complete anticipation of the present theory.

translated in the Latin version of Fix 'nunquamne sapietis,' which would of course have been expressed by οὐ φρονήσετε; Paley felt the difficulty and introduced his own conjecture ἀφρονήσετε. But though this will give the required sense, it is not necessary if we interpret φρονήσετε in the sense 'adopt such wisdom as this' which has just been denounced. In this case also οὐ may be taken as summing up the several denials which Orestes has just uttered.

But if this is the origin of the combination οὐ μὴ in prohibitions, and it is essentially interrogative in character, there can be no doubt that it was felt and used as appropriate in particular circumstances without there being necessarily present any conscious memory or apprehension of its history. And accordingly there is no need for us to be continually reminding ourselves of it by punctuating with an interrogation point. Indeed there are some instances where it is combined with other imperative forms so closely that inconvenience would be felt if the attempt were made to separate them by punctuation or intonation. This fact is not indeed decisive, as is sometimes said, against the interrogative origin here attributed to the οὐ μὴ form of prohibition. Granting that it was felt as a simple prohibitive imperative there is no reason why it should not be combined directly with other imperative expressions. So in Eur. Bacch. 343 we have first the interrupting command (οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα), stopping Kadmus, who is approaching to put a bacchic wreath on the head of Pentheus; then a positive command expressed by the future (βακχεύσεις δ' ἰών), and then a further prohibition with μηδέ (μηδ' ἐξομόρξει μωρίαν τήν σήν ἐμοί): and so the example from Ar. Nub. 296 quoted above is followed immediately by the imperative ἀλλ' εὐφύμει.

It seems to be a weighty objection to the theory that in both the οὐ μὴ constructions the combination οὐ μὴ has the force of a strong single negative (Goodwin, *M. T.* § 89), that, if that were true, whatever οὐ σωφρονήσεις taken interrogatively may mean, οὐ μὴ σωφρονήσεις, also taken interrogatively, ought to express the same meaning, only with added strength. But in fact the latter has just the opposite meaning to the former.

Remarks upon this paper were made by Professor Gildersleeve.

16. Report of the Committee on the Reform of English Spelling, by the Chairman, Professor F. A. March of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

The Philological Society of England has past a resolution requesting H. Sweet, Esq., to communicate with us in order to ascertain whether it is practicable to effect a complete agreement with the American Philological Association, so that "a joint scheme might be put forth under the authority of the two chief philological bodies of the English-speaking world."

Mr. Sweet has communicated with your Committee. This agreement on a joint scheme has been before this Association since 1875, and it is presumed that the Association will still regard it as desirable. As to the manner of preparing the joint list of amended words, the Committee recommend that the work be intrusted to a committee of the Association, and since the meetings of the Association are only annual, and successive ratifications and amendments might delay the final agreement very long, that power to act be granted to the Committee within the limits of former accepted reports, and in accordance with such other instructions as may be given at this meeting.

An open letter has been address to the Committee by T. R. Vickroy, Ph. D., of St. Louis, urging it to recommend to this Association a number of new types. The Committee does not see the way clear to any additional recommendations on the subject of new types.

On motion, the report was approved. The Committee was continued another year, and the names of Professor W. F. Allen of the University of Wisconsin, and of Professor Thomas R. Price of Columbia College, New York, were added, so that the Committee now consists of Messrs. March (Chairman), Allen, Child, Lounsbury, Price, Trumbull, and Whitney. The Committee was empowered to act within the limits imposed by their report as accepted by the American Philological Association.

The Secretary announced the election of the following new members :

Frank B. Tarbell, Professor of Greek, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
Thaddeus D. Kenneson, Graduate Student, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Hans C. G. Jagemann, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Henry Preble, Tutor in Latin, Harvard Univeristy, Cambridge, Mass.

William Wells Eaton, Andover, Mass.

Charles E. Bennett, Graduate Student, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Maurice Bloomfield, Professor of Sanskrit, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

E. M. Tomlinson, Professor of Greek, Alfred University, Alfred Centre, N. Y.

On behalf of the Auditing Committee, Professor Henry F. Burton reported that the accounts of the Treasurer had been examined and compared with the vouchers and found correct. The report was accepted.

Professor Toy, on behalf of the committee appointed to nominate officers for the year 1882-83, reported as follows :

For *President* — Professor Milton W. Humphreys, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

For *Vice-Presidents* — Professor M. L. D'Ooge, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Professor Thomas D. Seymour, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

For *Secretary and Curator* — Professor Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

For *Treasurer* — Charles J. Buckingham, Esq., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

For additional members of the *Executive Committee* —

Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Professor Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

Professor Thomas R. Price, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.

Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.

Professor William D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.



On motion, the report was accepted, and the persons therein named were declared elected to the offices to which they were respectively nominated.

Professor Van Benschoten reported for the committee on time and place of meeting. It was recommended that the next session be held at Middletown, Conn. On motion, this part of the report was accepted. After considerable discussion, the determination of the precise time of the beginning of the meeting was left to the Executive Committee.

The reading of papers was resumed.

17. Emendation to Euripides's *Cyclops*, v. 507, by Professor T. D. Seymour of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

In the second episode of the *Cyclops* of Euripides, Odysseus comes forth from the cave and tells the chorus of satyrs what had taken place within. Polyphemus had kindled his fire and milked his cows, and when the water boiled and the coals were ready, he killed two of the Greeks and roasted the rump and boiled their limbs. Then, sated with his feast, the monster reclined upon the ground. The Ithacan, according to a divine suggestion, then bore to the Cyclops a bowl of Maron's wine, with which he was pleased and of which he demanded another and another draught. Then he turned to song and (Odysseus tells the satyrs), delighted with this draught of Bacchus, desired to go for a revel to his brothers, (445) ἐπὶ κῶμον ἔρπειν πρὸς κασιγνήτους θέλει | Κύκλωπας ἥσθεις τῷδε Βακχίου ποτῶ. About sixty lines after this story of Odysseus, after the hero had made known his plan for revenge, the Cyclops appears on the scene with the following words: (503) παπαπαῖ, πλέως μὲν οἴνου, | γάνυμαι δὲ δαιτὸς ἥβη, | σκάφος ὀλκὰς ὥς γεμισθείς | ποτὶ σέλμα γαστρὸς ἄκρας. | (507) ὑπάγει μ' ὁ χόρτος εὐφρων | ἐπὶ κῶμον ἦρος ὥραις, | ἐπὶ Κύκλωπας ἀδελφούς. | φέρε μοι, ξεῖνε, φέρ', ἄσκον ἔνδος μοι.

It certainly is quite unexpected by us here that Polyphemus should speak of the grass, the herbage, as inviting him to go to his brothers. ὁ χόρτος ἦρος ὥραις cannot be a poetical expression for "the charming weather of spring." It cannot mean "the grass invites me to sit down here and drink," for v. 541 comes as a fresh and attractive thought, καὶ μὴν λαχνῶδές γ' οἶδας ἀνθηρᾶ χλόη. There for the first time he thinks of lying down and drinking before his own cave. That ἐπὶ Κύκλωπας ἀδελφούς is in apposition with and explanatory of ἐπὶ κῶμον, is shown by the other uses of κῶμος within a few lines; as v. 451, κῶμον μὲν αὐτὸν τοῦδ' ἀπαλλάξω, where the emphasis is not upon τοῦδε, but it is taken for granted that if he has a κῶμος he will go to his brothers. So v. 534, πυγμαῖς ὁ κῶμος λοιδόρον τ' ἔριν φιλεῖ, where κῶμος as usual implies companions in drinking, and is contrasted distinctly with remaining and drinking at home. We must remember also that in vs. 507 fg. we expect only the statement by the Cyclops of the wish which was reported by Odysseus in vs. 445 fg.

If we are dissatisfied with the present text we need have the less scruple in changing it, since the tradition of this play has been notoriously corrupt. Bernhardt calls attention to v. 397, δίδου μαγείρῳ carelessly written for "Αἰδου μαγείρῳ, v. 247, ἱμεροσκόου for εἰμ' ὀρεσκόου, v. 571, σιγῶντα for σπῶντα, v. 677, κατέκλυσε

for κατέκαυσε. If, then, we consider ourselves at liberty to change the text, I would propose to read v. 507 ὑπάγει μ' ὁ φόρτος κτλ. "I am full of wine and delight in the youthful beauty of the feast, laden to the top of my stomach like a merchant vessel with her hull filled to the deck. My *lading* leads me on to a revel in the time of spring, to go to my brothers, the Cyclopes. Come, stranger, give me the bottle." He is heavily laden, but is excited, not burdened, by the load.

18. On the Smile of Aphrodite, Theoc. I. 95, 96, by Professor T. D. Seymour.

Theocritus in general is surprisingly free from that affectation of curious learning which we are accustomed to call Alexandrian, from the antiquarian spirit of Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes. The scenes and characters of his idyls are pictured most distinctly in an apparently unconscious manner, which conceals all its art. But in the song of Thyrsis, in the first idyl, the fates have been sadly unpropitious to the mss. and to us, or the poet took much less than his usual care to make the situation clear and present a picture with firmly drawn lines. Daphnis pines away contending against the might of love. For whom he pines we know not. Hermes comes from the mountain to comfort him, and asks him of whom he is so much enamored, but no reply is vouchsafed. The herdsmen come, Priapus comes; to these, too, Daphnis makes no reply. Then comes Aphrodite, sweet and smiling. But she upbraids and taunts Daphnis, who in turn mocks at her. Then he bids farewell to the rivers, trees, and beasts of Sicily, and dies. The story of Daphnis, more than anything else in Theocritus, has been the subject of discussion and conjecture. It seems to be pretty well agreed now that the Daphnis of the first idyl is to be treated alone, that his story can receive little light from the Daphnis of Stesichorus or from the Daphnis of the other idyls. We must acquiesce in our ignorance of the story. Upon one point, however, i. e., the attitude of Aphrodite toward Daphnis, perhaps more light may be thrown by the consideration of vs. 95, 96, ἦνθέ γε μὰν ἄδεῖα καὶ ἅ Κίπρις γελάοισα, | λάθρια μὲν γελάοισα, βαρὺν δ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ἔχοισα. In the second of these verses the mss. are agreed in giving λάθρια or some collateral form, λάθρα or λάθρη. The phrase "secretly smiling," however, was thought to be offensive. It could hardly mean "laughing in her sleeve," for the tone of the goddess in addressing Daphnis is much rather that of open taunt and exultation. So it could hardly mean a "quiet laugh." Hence ἄδεα has been adopted by Hermann and Fritzsche, although it is easy to see how ἄδεα might have been written carelessly from the ἄδεῖα above; but it is impossible to believe that λάθρια should have displaced ἄδεα in all mss. Ahrens proposed to read λάδρα μὲν ἐκγελάωσα, "scornfully laughing out at him." Wordsworth proposed ἀθρήν (for ἀθρεῖν) from ἀθρέω, as accusative of specification, "laughing at the sight." These emendations are uncertain if not improbable, and also seem unnecessary. We notice the meaning of γελάω in v. 36 of this very idyl, ἀλλ' οὐκὰ μὲν τήνον ποτιδέρκεται ἄνδρα γελάωσα | ἄλλοκα δ' αὖ ποτὶ τὸν βίπτει νόον. "This maiden now *bestows her smiles* on one lover and again lends an attentive ear to the other." Compare also VII. 156, ὧς ἐπὶ σωρῶ | αὖτις ἐγὼ πάξαιμι μέγα πτόνον· ἃ δὲ γελάσσαι | δράγματα καὶ μάκωνας ἐν ἀμφοτέραισιν ἔχοντες. "May I again be present at such a harvest-home, may I fix the great winning shovel in the heap of grain, and may the goddess of the grain *smile* upon me with

sheaves and poppies in her arms." In these smiles is nothing of scorn, nor contempt, nor mockery, nor amusement, nor simply pleasure and satisfaction; the principal element is good-will, favor. This meaning seems probable for v. 96, and this view is strengthened by vs. 138 fg. *χὼ μὲν τόσσ' εἰπὼν ἀπεπαύσατο· τὸν δ' Ἀφροδίτα | ἤθελ' ἀνορθῶσαι.* "As he said this he sank back and died, but *Aphrodite strove to raise him up.*" The goddess, then, does not come to insult and mock Daphnis, but with the hope that he at last will yield to her authority and be saved. She comes with the same good-will which filled the hearts of Hermes and the others who came before her. But her authority had been slighted and she pretends anger.

The signification of *βαρὺν δ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ἔχουσα* demands more careful consideration. *βαρὺν* seems to mean savage, cruel, angry, as four lines below we find *Κύπρι βαρεῖα*; II. 3, *ὡς τὸν ἐμοὶ βαρὺν εὐντα φίλον καταδήσομαι ἄνδρα.* In III. 15 Eros is *βαρὺς θεός*. *ἀνέχουσα* is more troublesome, but it is used literally of holding up a torch, and figuratively as in Eur. Cyclops, 203, *ἄνεχε, πάρεχε,* "show here, let's see."

The whole passage thus considered gives us: "Next came Aphrodite sweet and smiling with favor; *secretly* smiling upon him, but pretending to be angry." This furnishes the contrast required by *λάθρια μὲν*. It is nearly Milton's "Vaunting with rage but racked with deep despair." It receives the best possible illustration from a probable imitation by Nonnus, Dion. XXXIV. 303, *εἶχε νόον γελόωντα, χόλον δ' ἀνέφηνε προσώπῳ*, which Meineke quotes, but with the remark that Nonnus reversed the situation.

With this interpretation the reading of the MSS. can stand, and is to be preferred to any conjecture yet proposed.

So far as I know, Zetsche of Altenburg, in a program of 1865, was the first to call due attention to the fact that Aphrodite was not an enemy of Daphnis. He, however, thought the passage corrupt, and intended to propose a remedy in a program which I think has not yet appeared. After writing this I find some similar views in an inaugural dissertation by Krumbholz, Rostock, 1873. He, however, reads *ἀμὰ* for *ἀνὰ*, an emendation which seems not only unnecessary but inadmissible.

## 19. General Considerations on the Indo-European Case-system, by Professor W. D. Whitney of Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Professor Whitney called attention to the great and hitherto unsolved difficulty of the Indo-European declension, in all its items, of number, gender, and case. The numerous attempts at explaining the case-system are conveniently reviewed and destructively criticised by Penka (Wien, 1878), whose own theory, however, is not less untenable than any of the rest; and the most recent investigations seem to be open to serious exception, in method or in results. It was intended in this paper simply to clear the ground a little, and mainly in a negative way.

A few things in regard to the formation and use of the cases are fairly well established. Thus, in the first place, the exceptional character of the genitive, as an adnominal case; the analogies of its use are with the adjectives, its more recent new forms are of adjective kindred, and the explanation of its origin constitutes a part of the general subject of secondary adjective-formation. In the second place, of the remaining cases, all adverbial in value, at least three are clearly

recognizable as made primarily to express local relations: the ablative is the *from*-case; the locative is the *in*- or *at*-case; the instrumental is the *by*- or *with*-case. There is no reason, in the present condition of our knowledge of language, why we should question this, or look for anything more ultimate. All sign-making, whether in the way of words or of forms, begins with the designation of what is most apprehensible by the senses, most physical; and no relations have more this character than relations of place; from their expressions, as is abundantly seen in the history of adverbs, come by figurative transfer expressions of time, of manner, of cause, and so on.

As regards now further the dative case, its primary value is hitherto disputed and questionable. To say, as one or two have lately done, that the dative expresses originally a grammatical relation (that of remoter object), and not a local one, is simply to make a confession of ignorance while trying to give it the aspect of positive knowledge. There is no such thing in language as a form originally expressive of a grammatical relation; this must always be the final outcome of something at first grosser and more physical. Nothing is gained by giving such an account of the case, and its explanation may be adjourned to a time of better knowledge.

The same objection applies to any alleged "explanation" of the accusative case as that denoting the grammatical relation of object of a verb (or, yet worse, denoting relation to a verb—as if all the other cases, except the genitive, had not that value). This, again, is only equivalent to saying that we are unable as yet to discover what lies behind the objective use of the accusative. But we are perhaps not reduced so far. There is nothing substantial in the way of our paralleling the accusative with the ablative etc., as a case of local relation, the *to*-case. In favor of this may be alleged the extreme improbability that in a scheme of designation of local relations the *to*-relation would be left out (if not here, we should be driven to seek it in the dative); and further, especially, the perfectly natural and easy way in which a *to*-case would be convertible to the case of the direct object. There are abundant signs in early Indo-European language of the use of the accusative also as goal of motion. We are not to expect a demonstration of this origin, or a classification of accusative uses which forces us back to the *to*-relation as the only possible fundamental one; things do not go that way in language. But the more the necessity is realized of seeking a physical relation underneath or behind a so-called grammatical one, the more, it is believed, will the explanation of the accusative as primarily the *to*-case commend itself to general acceptance.

The nominative remains, as a point of special difficulty, because we should naturally expect in it the bare stem. The probability is much greater here than anywhere else in the system of a mere repetitional demonstrative, grown on to the stem; although there are other possibilities; and the suggested quasi-ablative value is by no means to be discarded as absurd—"from this, action, to that" is a conceivable first model for a simple clause, with subject and object.

Notwithstanding the labor and ingenuity expended upon the matter, it can hardly be claimed that a successful beginning has been made of tracing the case-endings to the elements, pronominal or other, out of which they should have arisen. An isolated explanation, of more or less plausibility, for one or two elements out of a considerable system, while all the other elements remain obscure, is of no appreciable value. But a point of primary and fundamental importance

appears to be this: as the subject of formation of the genitive case is a part of the more general subject of secondary adjective-formation, so that of the other or adverbial cases belongs with adverb-formation, and must be solved along with that. There is no original historical distinction between an adverb and a case-form. Not that every adverb is primarily a case-form, any more than every case-form is primarily an adverb; the two formations simply run together in the past, like adjective and noun, or, later, adverb and preposition; and in the more recent history of our languages, down to modern time, adverbs and cases (other than genitives) exchange offices, as do adjectives and genitives. Doubtless there lies a stage yet further back, where adjective-formation and adverb-formation are as yet undifferentiated; but case-making lies hitherward from, or at least forms a part of, their differentiation.

20. On initial P in Gothic and Anglo-Saxon, by Charles P. G. Scott, Ph. D., of Columbia College, New York.

The paper was a contribution to the attempt to determine the extent of the appearance of initial *p* in Teutonic. All the words in Gothic and Anglosaxon having initial *p* were collected, and each word was traced, as far as it could be done with certainty, to its original tongue. Eliminating the words proved to be of foreign origin, and those due to editorial errors, a few of the remaining words appeared to be Teutonic, leaving a considerable number which give no satisfactory account of themselves.

The etymologies were traced out in full detail. Only results can here be given.

Marks: *s.* strong, *w.* weak, *m., f., n.* gender, *v.* verb, etc., † hápax-legómenon, ? doubtful, referring to the word or mark *immediately* preceding. Variant forms in parenthesis; only 'regular' variants are given. Regular native derivatives and compounds are not counted in the numbering, and are generally omitted in the Anglosaxon list. Proper names are reserved for special treatment.

## GOTHIC.

### A. WORDS OF LATIN ORIGIN.

#### I. DIRECTLY FROM LATIN:

1. † *pund sm.*

#### II. FROM LATIN THRU GREEK:

2. *praitōria (praitauria) sf.*
- 2a. *praitōriaun n.*

### B. WORDS OF GREEK ORIGIN.

#### I. DIRECTLY FROM GREEK:

- |  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| 1. † <i>paintekustē wf.</i>                | 7. <i>prauvētēs sm.</i>   |
| 2. <i>paraklētus sm.</i>                   | 7a. <i>prauvētus sm.</i>  |
| 3. <i>paraskaiwē wf.</i>                   | 7b. <i>prauvēteis sf.</i> |
| 4. <i>paurpura (paurpaura) f.</i>          | 7c. <i>prauvēti sn.</i>   |
| 4a. <i>paurpurōn ww.</i>                   | 7d. <i>prauvētja wm.</i>  |
| 5. † <i>pistikeins adj.</i>                | 7e. <i>prauvētjan ww.</i> |
| 6. <i>praizbytairei (praizbytereī) wf.</i> | 8. <i>psalma sf.</i>      |
| 6a. † <i>praizbytairoi sn.</i>             | 8a. † <i>psalmō wf.</i>   |

#### II. FROM GREEK THRU LATIN:

9. *papa wm. (perhaps directly from Greek).*

**C. WORDS OF EASTERN ORIGIN.**

FROM HEBREW:

1. paska (pasxa) *wm.*

**D. WORDS OF SLAVIC ORIGIN.**

1. plinsjan *vv.* (and perhaps plats: see **F.** 3).

**E. WORDS OF TEUTONIC ORIGIN.**

- |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| 1. paida <i>sf.</i>      | 2. † ana-praggan <i>red. v.</i>              |
| 1a. ga-paidōn <i>vv.</i> | 3. † puggs <i>sm.</i> (or pugg? <i>sn.</i> ) |

**F. WORDS OF UNCERTAIN ORIGIN.**

- |                                 |                                      |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. † peika (-bagms <i>sm.</i> ) | 3. plats <i>sm.</i> (Slavic? Teut.?) |
| 2. † plapja <i>sf.</i> (Greek?) |                                      |

**ANGLOSAXON.**

The names following certain words indicate that the word is found first or only in the authority cited: *Som.*, Somner; *Ben.*, Benson; *Bosw.*, Bosworth; *Ettm.*, Ettmüller; *Lye*; *Leo*; *Earle*; *Skeat*.

For the sake of brevity, definitions are omitted in most cases; but they are partly supplied by the direct Eng. derivatives of the Anglosaxon, which are in small capitals.

**A. WORDS OF LATIN ORIGIN.**

**I. DIRECTLY FROM LATIN, WITH ANGLOSAXON INFLECTION:**

*a. Ecclesiastical terms.*

- |                                  |                          |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. pāganisc <i>adj.</i> PAGANISH | 4. prīm <i>sf.</i> PRIME |
| 2. pæll (pell) <i>sm.</i> PALL   | 5. † pūr <i>adj.</i>     |
| 3. predician <i>vv.</i>          |                          |

*β. Botanical terms.*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 6. palm <i>sf.</i> PALM                           | 13. pīn <i>sf.</i> (pinn?) PINE                  |
| 7. papig (popig) <i>sn.</i> ? POPPY               | 14. plante <i>wf.</i> (plant? <i>sf.</i> ) PLANT |
| 8. peru (pere) <i>sf.</i> (pera <i>wm.</i> ) PEAR | 15. † polenta <i>wm.</i> (polente? <i>wf.</i> )  |
| 9. peruince <i>sf.</i> ? PERIWINKLE               | 16. polleion (polleian) <i>sn.</i>               |
| 10. pic <i>sm.</i> ? PITCH                        | 17. port <i>sn.</i> ?                            |
| 11. pirige (pyrige) <i>wm.</i>                    | 18. portlāca <i>wm.</i> ?                        |
| 12. pisa <i>wm.</i> (pise <i>wf.</i> ) PEASE      |  |

*γ. Miscellaneous words.*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 19. palant (alent) <i>sn.</i> ?                               | 25. pāl <i>sm.</i> POLE   |
| 20. paled <i>adj.</i>   | 26. pærl (pearl) <i>sf.</i> ? PEARL                                 |
| 21. pann (pan, pon) <i>sm.</i> ?                              | 27. penig (pending, etc.) <i>sm.</i> PENNY                          |
| 22. papol (popol, papel) <i>sm.</i> ? PEBBLE                  | 28. † pihtin <i>sn.</i> ? ( <i>Leo</i> )                            |
| 23. papelan <i>vv.</i> ( <i>Leo</i> )                         | 29. pinn <i>sf.</i> <i>pen</i> , <i>style</i> , PIN ( <i>Som.</i> ) |
| 24. pipligend (pipelgend, pypylgend, etc.) <i>pres. part.</i> | 30. pen <i>sn.</i> ? inclosure, PEN ( <i>Leo</i> )                  |
|   | 30a. on-pennan <i>vv.</i> UNPEN                                     |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 31. pinsian <i>ww.</i>  | 41. präfoſt <i>sm.</i>                       |
| 32. pīl <i>smf.</i> ? PILE, <i>stake</i> , etc.                                   | 42. profian <i>ww.</i> PROVE                 |
| 33. pīl <i>smn.</i> ? (pīla <i>wm.</i> ) mortar<br>(Hence pīlan <i>ww.</i> pound) | 43. pumic (-stān <i>sm.</i> ) PUMICE         |
| 34. pīn <i>smf.</i> ? (PINE <i>v.</i> )   | 44. pund <i>sn.</i> POUND (weight, money)    |
| 35. plūm (-feder <i>sm.</i> )   | 45. punt <i>sn.</i> ? PUNT                   |
| 36. port <i>sm.</i> PORT, <i>haven</i>  | 46. pylce (pilce) <i>wf.</i> PILCH           |
| 37. port <i>gf.</i> (porte <i>wf.</i> ?) PORT, <i>gate</i>                        | 47. pyle <i>sn.</i> ? PILLOW                 |
| 38. portic <i>sm.</i>   | 48. *pyltan <i>ww.</i> FELT ( <i>Skeat</i> ) |
| 39. posling <i>sm.</i>  | 49. pyngan <i>ww.</i> PING                   |
| 40. post <i>smf.</i> ? POST   | 50. pytt (pitt) <i>sm.</i> PIT               |

## II. FROM LATIN UNCHANGED:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 51. Pater-noster <i>smn.</i> PATER-NOSTER | 53. †priosres <i>pl.</i> ( <i>Lye</i> ) |
| 52. †primus <i>adj.</i>                   | 54. †proletarii ( <i>Orosius</i> )      |

## III. FROM LATIN THRU OLD FRENCH:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 55. †pais <i>sub.</i> PEACE ( <i>Chron.</i> 1135)              | 58. pouerte <i>sub.</i> POVERTY ( <i>Lye</i> )                        |
| 56. prisun <i>sub.</i> PRISON ( <i>Chron.</i> 1112,<br>1137)   | 59. poure <i>adj.</i> POOR ( <i>Lye</i> )                             |
| 57. †priuilegie <i>sub.</i> PRIVILEGE ( <i>Chron.</i><br>1137) | 60. poute? [piete?] <i>sub.</i> PIETY ( <i>Lye</i> )                  |
|  | 61. pynt <i>sub.</i> PINT ( <i>Som., Ben., Lye,</i><br><i>Bosw.</i> ) |

These ar not Anglosaxon, but Erly Middle English. There ar no references except as givn.

## IV. FROM LATIN THRU CELTIC:

62. panne *wf.* PAN, *vessel* (Lat. *patina*)

## B. WORDS OF GREEK ORIGIN.

## I. FROM GREEK THRU LATIN, WITH ANGLOSAXON INFLEXION:

## a. Ecclesiastical terms.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. pāpa <i>wm.</i> POPE   | 4. preōst <i>sm.</i> PRIEST                 |
| 2. pentecoste <i>wf.</i> ? (pentecosten <i>sn.</i> )<br>PENTECOST | 5. psalm (sealm, salm) <i>sm.</i> PSALM     |
| 3. pistol <i>sm.</i> PISTLE, <i>letter</i>                        | 6. psaltere (psalter?) <i>sn.</i> ? PSALTER |

## β. Botanical terms.

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| 7. peterselige (petersilie, -sylige, si-<br>lige, -siliūm) <i>wf.</i> ? | 9. plūme <i>wf.</i> ? PLUM |
| 8. peonia <i>wm.</i> ? (peonie <i>wf.</i> ) PEONY                       | 10. prutene <i>sn.</i> ?   |

## γ. Miscellaneous words.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 11. †palistas <i>smpl.</i> ( <i>Orosius</i> ) | 15. platum <i>sn.</i>  |
| 12. †pellican <i>sm.</i> ? PELICAN            | 16. purpur <i>sm.</i> ? (purpura <i>wm.</i> , -e?<br><i>wf.</i> ) PURPLE |
| 13. †philosoph <i>sm.</i>                     |  |
| 14. plaster <i>sn.</i> PLASTER                |  |

## II. FROM LATIN-GREEK UNCHANGED:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 17. †pandher ( <i>sic: Grein</i> ) <i>sub.</i> PANTHER | 20. psalterium <i>sub.</i>                           |
| 18. paralysis <i>sub.</i> PARALYSIS                    | 21. pepones <i>sub.</i> , <i>pl.</i> ( <i>Bot.</i> ) |
| 19. †prologus <i>sub.</i>                              | 22. polion <i>sub.</i> POLY ( <i>Bot.</i> )          |

III. FROM LATIN-GREEK THRU OLD FRENCH:

23. per, pere *sub.* PIER, *Som.* (Gr. *πέτρα*)  
Not Anglosaxon, but Erly Mid. Eng.

IV. FROM LATIN-GREEK THRU CELTIC:

24. prætt (præt) *sm.* (Gr. *πρακτικ-ός*)  
Hence prættig *adj.* = Eng. PRETTY.  
24a. pæt *sm.*?  
Hence pætig *adj.* — Same as preceding, with loss of *r*; cf. sprecan, specan.

C. WORDS OF EASTERN ORIGIN.

ALL THRU GREEK AND LATIN:

I. FROM OLD PERSIAN:

- |                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. paradise <i>sm.</i> ? PARADISE | 3. pāwa (peā) <i>wm.</i> PEA-cock             |
| 2. pard <i>sm.</i> PARD           | 4. persoc (persuc) <i>sm.</i> ( <i>Bot.</i> ) |

II. FROM SANSKRIT:

5. pipor, pepor *sm.*? PEPPER (*Bot.*)

III. FROM HEBREW:

- |                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| 6. pascha <i>sm.</i> PASCH | 7. pharisee (farisee) <i>sm.</i> PHARISEE |
|----------------------------|---|

D. WORDS OF CELTIC ORIGIN.

I. DIRECTLY FROM CELTIC:

- |                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 1. peac <i>sm.</i> ? PEAK        | 6. pot <i>sm.</i> ? POT ( <i>Leo</i> )       |
| 2. pīc <i>sf.</i> PIKE           | 7. potian <i>wv.</i> PUT                     |
| 3. poc (pocc) <i>sm.</i> ? POCK  | 8. pōl (pul?) <i>sm.</i> POOL                |
| 4. poha (pohha) <i>wm.</i> purse | 9. pund <i>sm.</i> ? POUND, <i>fold, pen</i> |
| 5. geposu <i>sf.</i> POSE        |  |

II. FROM CELTIC THRU SCANDINAVIAN:

10. ploh *sm.*? PLOUGH

E. WORDS OF TEUTONIC ORIGIN.

I. FROM SCANDINAVIAN:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. pad <i>sm.</i> ? padde <i>wf.</i> ? PADD-ock | 3. pīga (pīge?) <i>wf.</i>                         |
| 2. pæran <i>wv.</i>                             | 4. posa, pusa <i>wm.</i> (pose, puse? <i>wf.</i> ) |

II. NATIV ANGLOSAXON:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 5. pād <i>sf.</i>  | 10. pluccian <i>wv.</i> PLUCK                  |
| 6. pæð <i>sm.</i> PATH.  | 11. pricu <i>sf.</i> (prica <i>wm.</i> ) PRICK |
| 7. pearroc <i>sm.</i> PARK   | 12. princ <i>sm.</i> ?                         |
| 8. peorð <i>sm.</i> ? ( <i>Runic p</i> )   | 13. pullian <i>wv.</i> PULL                    |
| 9. pleōn <i>sv.</i> ( <i>Hence</i> pleoh <i>sm.</i> ,<br>pliht <i>sf.</i> , plihtan <i>wv.</i> ) | 14. pung <i>sm.</i> ?                          |
|  | 15. pīpe <i>wf.</i> PIPE ( <i>imitativ</i> )   |



## F. WORDS DUE TO MISTAKES.

## I. MISTAKES IN TRANSLATION :

1. † "Pernex, a swift, martin," *Bosw.*; *Riddle* 41, l. 66, ed. *Grein*.  
Due to orig. Latin *plus pernix aquilis*, where *pernix* is an *adj.*, 'swift,' *rapid*.
2. "Pada . . . volucris quæ cadivis in prælio vescuntur," *Ben.*, *Appendix*.  
Due to comp. *salowig-pāda*, *wk. adj.*, applied to the raven.
3. † "Pila? a pile, heap," *Bosw.* after *Lye*; pile *wf.*, *Leo*; hence *pīlan ww.* "to pile up," *Bosw.* after *Lye*; *Leo*.  
Due to a mistranslation of Exod. xvi. 14, on *pīlan gepīlod*, properly, *pounded in a mortar*. (See **A.** I. γ. 33.)

## II. MISTAKES IN READING MSS. :

4. † "Pul-stæf, a pole-staff," *Bosw.* after *Lye*; *Leo*.  
A misreading of *Greg. Past. Care* 37.2 (*p.* 266, ed. *Sweet*), where the Hatton MS. has dat. *pīil-stæfe*, and the Cotton MS. *pīl-stafe*, in the sense of *pestile*.
5. † "Proletarn, proletarii, Oros. 4. 1," *Lye*.  
Bosworth's careful edition gives (*Oros. Bk. IV. ch. 1, § 2*) the Latin form *proletarii* without variants. The Ags. undotted double *i* is easily mistaken for *u* or *n*.
6. "Pyrige, an, *f.*, pera, Cot. 217," *Ettm.*  
This cannot be the Lat. *pēra* from Greek *πῆρα*, but is rather a Low Lat. variant of *pirus*. *Ettm.* gives the reg. "pirige, *pirus*" in its proper place.
7. "Perewes *Sapa*, R. 32," *Lye*, *Bosw.*  
For "pere was [wōs] *sapa*," *Ben.* = pear's juice.

The next four instances are due to the common confusion of the Anglosaxon letter *wēn* with *p*.

8. "Plips *balbus*," *Ben.*; *Lye*, *Bosw.*  
For *wlīps*, *wlīsp*, *LISP*.
9. "Por-hana, a ruff, pheasant," *Bosw.*; *Lye*, *Leo*.  
For *wōr-hana*, 'moor-cock.'
10. "Pinpel, a pimple, *anabola*," etc., *Lye*.  
For *wīnpel*, Eng. *WIMPLE*, a cloak.
11. "Pig-telgode *diplois*," *Lye*, "pigtelgod *diplois*," *Ben.*  
For "wig-telgode *diplois*," *Lye*, 'a doublet, cloak,' *Bosw.*, who puts the word *s. v.* *wīg*, *war*.  
Similarly we find *wopig* in *Lye*, but with a reference to *popig*.
12. † "Posc *basis*," *Ben.*, followed in alphabetical order by "post, *postis*, *basis*."  
For *post*, Anglosaxon *t* and *c* being easily confused.
13. † "Ped *adj. immaturus* (scheint verschrieben für *bed*, quod v.)," *Leo*.  
Cf. "bed, ped *adj. immaturus* Hpt. gl. 518," *Leo*.
14. † "anc-pælgis? *nauffragium* Hpt. gl. 421, ist wahrscheinlich ein Druckfehler," *Leo*.  
Perhaps for \*an-swælgis, for \*and- (or on-) swelgendnis; cf. "swelgnyse i. q. swelgendnesse," *Lye*; "swelgendnyse, voracitas, deglutitio, *It.* vorago, gurgis, charybdis, barathrum, Cot. 46," *Lye*.

G. WORDS OF UNCERTAIN ORIGIN.

The etymologists hav offerd explanations of most of these words; but in no case does the evidence presented appear to be *conclusiv*. Where the evidence has seemd to be strong enuf to warrant it, the *probl* origin is indicated.

I. WORDS WELL AUTHENTICATED, OCCURRING IN CRITICAL EDITIONS OF ANGLOSAXON TEXTS. EXCEPT *plega* AND ITS DERIVATIVES, THEY ARE ALL RARE.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. pæcan <i>ww</i> . (Teut.?)             | 8. † portian <i>ww</i> .                          |
| 2. piða <i>wm</i> . PITH (Teut.?)         | 9. prass <i>sm</i> .? (Scand.? Lat.?)             |
| 3. † pine (-wincle <i>wf</i> .) (Lat.?)   | 10. preōne <i>sm</i> . (Scand.?)                  |
| 4. plæce <i>wf</i> .? (Teut.?)            | 11. prūt <i>adj</i> . PROUD.                      |
| 5. plætte <i>sm</i> . PAT (Teut.?)        | 12. punian <i>ww</i> . POUND. ( <i>Hence also</i> |
| 6. plega <i>wm</i> . PLAY (Teut. or Lat.) | PUN.)   |
| 7. plot <i>sm</i> . PLOT (Slavic? Teut.?) | 13. † pūta <i>wm</i> . POUT, a fish.              |

II. WORDS OCCURRING ONLY OR CHIEFLY IN MS. GLOSSARIES OR IN THE EARLY PRINTED DICTIONARIES, OR OTHERWISE SO CIRCUMSTANCED AS TO CAUSE DOUBT OF THEIR ORIGIN, SENSE, OR FORM.

1. palstre *Som.*, palster *Ettm.*, palstr *Lye*. (From pāl?)
2. "pang *toxicum*" *Som.*, *Ben*.
3. parian *ww*. (ā-parod, *Som*.)
4. pecg *sm*.? PIG? doubtful: *Earle ap. Skeat*. (Scand.?)
5. "petraoleum, *petroleum*," *Ben*. (Greek?)
6. pēnung: "land-pēnung," *Lye*.
7. "peord, a peon in chess," *Bosw.*, ascribed to *Lye*, but not found.
8. "peord, *vulva*," *Leo*. (Scand.?)
9. "pic-bred, *glans*," *Ben*.
10. pidele *sn*.? *Leo*.
11. pillsape *wf*.?
12. pince *sn*.? *Leo*. (Teut.?)
13. be-pincge *sn*.? (Teut.?)
14. † pinne *wf*.? *flask*.
15. pintel *sm*.? *Leo*. (Teut.?)
16. "pislefer-hūs *scriptorium*," *Lye*. (Greek?)
17. pīce? "pice *epistomium*," *Som*. (Celtic?)
18. pīlade? "pilade, pilede, *plumbatus*," *Som*. (Lat.?)
19. pīse, pīse? *adj*. (Lat.?)
20. "plegena *apricum*, Cot. 180," *Lye*.
21. "pletta *ovile*," *Ben.*, *Lye*. (Lat.?)
22. "plicit, *prora*; pliciter, *proreta*," *Leo*.
23. "pranga *caverna*," *Ben.*, *Lye*.
24. "præte *ornatus, excultus*," etc., *Som*. (*Prob. for prætig: see B. 23.*)
25. "prenan *nictare*," *Ben*.; "be-prenan, be-prewan . . . *nictare*," *Lye*. (Scand.?)
26. "preowst-hwile, *ictus oculi*, a moment," *Som*.; "preowt-hwīl, S.," *Bosw*.
27. "pritigan *pīpare*," *Lye*.
28. "prot-bore *forum*," *Ben*.; "prod-bore," *Lye*.
29. "pucl *priapus*," *Leo*.

30. "pud(d) *m. sulcus*, gl. Prud. 787," *Leo*.  
 31. "puduc *m. der Kropf, struma*, gl. Prud. 597," *Leo*.  
 32. "pun *bicoca*," *Ben.* ; "bicoca, hæferbleta vel pun," *Aelfr. gloss*.  
 33. "pund *talpa*, a mole or want [*sic*]," *Som.* ; *Ben.*  
 34. pytan: *ūtāpytan*, *Numbers* xvi. 14; also *pycan ūt*, *Chron.* 796, ed. *Earle*, where Gibson and Thorpe print *pytan*. If *pycan* is right, it is connected with *pīc* (see *D.* 2), and so of Celtic origin. Cf. *potian* *D.* I. 7.  
 35. "pytlan *caus. hohl ausarbeiten*," *Leo*, from Kemble's charters. (Lat.?)

## SUMMARY.

	Goth.	Ags.
Words of Latin origin . . . . .	2	62
“ “ Greek “ . . . . .	9	24
“ “ Eastern “ . . . . .	1	7
“ “ Slavic “ . . . . .	1	—
“ “ Celtic “ . . . . .	—	10
“ “ Teutonic “ . . . . .	—	—
{ Scand. . . . .	—	4
{ Nativ . . . . .	3	11
“ due tu mistakes . . . . .	—	14
“ of uncertain origin . . . . .	3	48
Total . . . . .	19	180

From the Anglosaxon total shud be deducted the words of Latin and Greek origin which hav bin transferd unchanged (10), or hav cum thru the Old French and ar rather Middle English (8); also the words due tu mistakes (14). We thus find the number of Anglosaxon words beginning with *p* tu be 148, of which 48 stil await a conclusiv explanation. They offer a tempting challenge tu the etymologist.

21. The Wages of Schoolmasters in Ancient Rome, by Dr. R. F. Leighton of Brooklyn, N. Y.; read by title, by the Secretary.

On motion of Mr. L. H. Buckingham, it was

*Resolved*, That the following minute be put on the Records, and be communicated to the parties concerned:

The American Philological Association desires to express its hearty thanks to the President and Fellows of Harvard College for the use of their halls for the meetings of the Association, to Colonel Theodore Lyman for his kind hospitality in entertaining the members of the society at his residence in Brookline, and to the gentlemen by whose liberality the pleasant excursion of Wednesday evening was made possible.

On motion, the Association then adjourned.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1882-83.

---

PRESIDENT.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

MARTIN L. D'OUGE,

THOMAS D. SEYMOUR.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

CHARLES R. LANMAN.

TREASURER.

CHARLES J. BUCKINGHAM.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The officers above named, and —

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE,

FRANCIS A. MARCH,

THOMAS R. PRICE,

J. HAMMOND TRUMBULL,

WILLIAM D. WHITNEY.

## MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.\*

---

Eben Alexander, East Tennessee University, Knoxville, Tenn.  
Frederic D. Allen, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
William F. Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.  
Joseph Anderson, Waterbury, Conn.  
N. L. Andrews, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.  
Stephen P. Andrews, 201 East Thirty-fourth st., New York, N. Y.  
William H. Appleton, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.  
John Avery, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.  
Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.  
J. W. Barnes, Perth Amboy, N. J.  
Charles C. Bates, Plymouth, Mass.  
H. Louis Baugher, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.  
C. T. Beatty, High School, East Saginaw, Mich.  
George Bendelari, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
Charles E. Bennett, 19 Bridgham st., Providence, R. I.  
James S. Blackwell, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.  
Maurice Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
E. W. Blyden, Monrovia College, Liberia.  
James R. Boise, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.  
Charles E. Brandt, Farmington, Conn.  
H. C. G. Brandt, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.  
Fisk P. Brewer, Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.  
John A. Broadus, Southern Baptist Theol. Seminary, Louisville, Ky.  
Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
L. H. Buckingham, English High School, Boston, Mass.  
Henry F. Burton, Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. (47 North av.).  
Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.  
Richard E. Call, Mohawk, N. Y.  
W. B. Carr, Leesburgh, Loudoun Co., Va.  
Franklin Carter, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.  
William C. Cattell, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

\* The addresses of this list have been corrected to date of printing, so far as practicable.

Talbot W. Chambers, 70 West Thirty-sixth st., New York, N. Y.  
Elie Charlier (Life Member), Central Park, New York, N. Y.  
Francis J. Child, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Albert S. Cook, Montville, N. J.  
Jacob Cooper, New Brunswick, N. J.  
Howard Crosby, University of New York, New York, N. Y.  
Edward P. Crowell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.  
S. E. D. Currier, 2 Cedar st., Roxbury, Mass.  
Charles Darwin, Library of the Geological Survey, Washington, D. C.  
Edward De Meritte, Chauncy-Hall School, Boston, Mass.  
Schele De Vere, University of Virginia.  
Martin L. D'Ooge, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
T. T. Eaton, Petersburg, Va.  
William Wells Eaton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.  
August Hjalmar Edgren, University of Lund, Sweden.  
George R. Entler, Franklin, N. Y.  
Carl W. Ernst, office of *Daily Advertiser*, Boston, Mass.  
Ambrose J. Faust, Washington, D. C.  
O. M. Fernald, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.  
Gustavus Fischer, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.  
M. M. Fisher, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.  
A. J. Fleet, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.  
John Forsyth, Newburgh, N. Y.  
Samuel Garner, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind.  
James M. Garnett, University of Virginia.  
Henry Garst, Otterbein University, Westerville, O.  
B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
Frank M. Gilley, 189 Washington av., Chelsea, Mass.  
Ralph L. Goodrich, U. S. Courts, Little Rock, Ark.  
William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Richard T. Greener, Howard University, Washington, D. C.  
James B. Greenough, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Ephraim W. Gurney, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
William Gardner Hale, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.  
Isaac H. Hall, 725 Chestnut st., Philadelphia, Pa.  
William G. Hammond, 1417 Lucas Place, St. Louis, Mo.  
H. McL. Harding, Brooks Academy, Cleveland, O.  
Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
William R. Harper, Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.  
Caskie Harrison, Dryburg, Halifax Co., Va.  
James A. Harrison, Washington and Lee Univ., Lexington, Va.  
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
William H. Hawkes, 1733 G st., N. W., Washington, D. C.  
B. J. Hawthorne, State Agricultural College, Corvallis, Oregon.  
Charles R. Hemphill, Columbia, S. C.

- Theophilus Heness, 159 York st., New Haven, Conn.  
Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Cambridge, Mass.  
Newton B. Hobart, Hudson, O.  
George O. Holbrooke, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
Selah Howell, Watertown, Mass.  
E. R. Humphreys, 129 West Chester park, Boston, Mass.  
Milton W. Humphreys, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.  
John T. Huntington, Hartford, Conn.  
Ashley D. Hurt, Male High School, Louisville, Ky.  
Hans C. G. Jagemann, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
Edwin E. Johnson, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
Henry Johnson, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.  
John L. Johnson, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss.  
John Norton Johnson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Elisha Jones, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
Robert P. Keep, Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass.  
Asahel C. Kendrick, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.  
T. D. Kenneson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
W. S. Kerruish, 222 Superior st., Cleveland, Ohio.  
John B. Kieffer, Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Pa.  
D. B. King, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
Louis Kistler, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.  
Miss Mary H. Ladd, Chauncy-Hall School, Boston, Mass.  
George M. Lane, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Lewis H. Lapham, 68 Gold st., New York, N. Y.  
C. W. Larned, U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.  
Albert G. Lawrence, Newport, R. I.  
R. F. Leighton, 109 Lefferts place, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
John M. Leonard, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.  
John R. Leslie, Newport, R. I.  
Thomas B. Lindsay, 20 Beacon st., Boston, Mass.  
William S. Liscomb, Providence, R. I.  
Thomas R. Lounsbury, Yale College, New Haven, Ct. (22 Lincoln st.).  
Rebecca S. Lowrey, 162 West Forty-seventh st., New York, N. Y.  
Jules Luquiens, Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.  
Merrick Lyon, University Grammar School, Providence, R. I.  
James C. Mackenzie, Classical School, Wilkesbarre, Pa.  
Irving J. Manatt, Marietta College, O.  
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
Philippe B. Marcou, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
D. S. Martin, Rutgers Female College, New York, N. Y.  
Winfred R. Martin, 20 East Twenty-eighth st., New York, N. Y.  
R. H. Mather, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.  
W. Gordon McCabe, University School, Petersburg, Va.

Irwin P. McCurdy, Frederick Female Seminary, Frederick City, Md.  
Joseph H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.  
Miss Harriet E. McKinstry, Lake Erie Female Seminary, Painesville, O.  
Charles M. Mead, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.  
John Meigs, Hill School, Pottstown, Pa.  
Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
Charles D. Morris, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
F. A. Muhlenberg, Univ. of Pa., Philadelphia, Pa. (4307 Walnut st.).  
Wilfred H. Munro, De Veaux College, Suspension Bridge, N. Y.  
Joseph H. Myers, Milton-on-Hudson, N. Y.  
C. K. Nelson, Brookeville Academy, Brookeville, Md.  
Edward North, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.  
J. O. Notestein, University of Wooster, O.  
Bernard F. O'Connor, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
Howard Osgood, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.  
Charles P. Otis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.  
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
Lewis R. Packard, Yale College, New Haven, Conn. (226 Church st.).  
William A. Packard, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.  
E. G. Parsons, Sumner Academy, South Byfield, Mass.  
Tracy Peck, Yale College, New Haven, Conn. (87 Wall st.).  
William T. Peck, High School, Providence, R. I. (350 Pine st.).  
William R. Perkins, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.  
Bernadotte Perrin, Western Reserve College, Cleveland, O.  
Edward D. Perry, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
William C. Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (12 Barnes st.).  
Samuel Porter, National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.  
L. S. Potwin, Western Reserve College, Cleveland, O.  
John W. Powell, Washington, D. C.  
Henry Preble, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Thomas R. Price, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
Charles W. Reid, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.  
DeWitt T. Reiley, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.  
William A. Reynolds, Wilmington, Del.  
Leonard W. Richardson, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
Rufus B. Richardson, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.  
W. G. Richardson, Austin College, Sherman, Texas.  
Lawrence Rust, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.  
Julius Sachs, Classical School, 38 W. Fifty-ninth st., New York, N. Y.  
Wesley C. Sawyer, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.  
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.  
Henry Schliemann, Athens, Greece.  
C. P. G. Scott, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
Walter Q. Scott, Wooster University, Wooster, O.  
Jotham B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass.



- Thomas D. Seymour, Yale College, New Haven, Conn. (174 Orange st.).  
 Joseph Alden Shaw, Episcopal Academy, Cheshire, Conn.  
 Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Henry E. Shepherd, Baltimore, Md.  
 L. A. Sherman, State University, Lincoln, Nebraska.  
 Charles Short, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
 E. G. Sihler, Classical School, 38 W. Fifty-ninth st., New York, N. Y.  
 Clement Lawrence Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Frank Webster Smith, Lincoln, Mass.  
 Edward Snyder, Illinois Industrial University, Champaign, Ill.  
 A. B. Stark, Logan Female College, Russellville, Ky.  
 Benjamin F. Stem, Classical Institute, Easton, Pa.  
 Frederick Stengel, School of Mines, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
 William A. Stevens, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.  
 Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.  
 Austin Stickney, 35 West Seventeenth st., New York, N. Y.  
 Charles W. Super, Ohio University, Athens, O.  
 Miss A. L. Sweetser, Mount Holyoke Seminary, South Hadley, Mass.  
 Frank B. Tarbell, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
 Franklin Taylor, High School, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Zachary P. Taylor, Central High School, Cleveland, O.  
 John Tetlow, Girls' Latin School, Boston, Mass.  
 J. Henry Thayer, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.  
 Calvin Thomas, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
 William E. Thompson, Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.  
 Edward M. Tomlinson, Alfred University, Alfred Centre, N. Y.  
 Crawford H. Toy, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
 William H. Treadwell, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
 J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.  
 Francis W. Tustin, University at Lewisburgh, Pa.  
 Milton Valentine, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.  
 James C. Van Benschoten, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.  
 Addison VanName, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
 C. Osborne Ward, 486 Adelphi st., Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Miss Julia E. Ward, Mount Holyoke Seminary, South Hadley, Mass.  
 Henry C. Warren, 67 Mount Vernon st., Boston, Mass.  
 Minton Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 W. B. Webster, Military Institute, Norfolk, Va.  
 R. F. Weidner, Rock Island, Illinois.  
 James C. Welling, Columbian University, Washington, D. C.  
 Benjamin W. Wells, Friends' School, Providence, R. I.  
 J. B. Weston, Christian Biblical Institute, Standfordville, N. Y.  
 Mrs. A. E. Weston, Christian Biblical Institute, Standfordville, N. Y.  
 A. S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Ct. (27 Eld st.).  
 Benjamin I. Wheeler, Providence, R. I.

John H. Wheeler, University of Virginia.  
John Williams White, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
William Dwight Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
W. H. Whitsitt, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.  
J. Colver Wightman (Life Member), Taunton, Mass.  
Alonzo Williams, Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
R. H. Willis, Norwood, Nelson County, Va.  
Edwin H. Wilson, Middletown, Conn.  
William Epiphanius Wilson, King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia.  
John H. Wright, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

[Number of members, 221.]

---

THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS (ALPHABETIZED BY TOWNS)  
SUBSCRIBE FOR THE ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Albany, N. Y.: N. Y. State Library.  
Andover, Mass.: Phillips Academy.  
Andover, Mass.: Theological Seminary.  
Ann Arbor, Mich.: Michigan University.  
Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University.  
Baltimore, Md.: Peabody Institute.  
Bloomington, Monroe Co., Ind.: Indiana University.  
Boston, Mass.: Boston Athenæum.  
Boston, Mass.: Boston Public Library.  
Brooklyn, N. Y.: The Brooklyn Library.  
Brunswick, Maine: Bowdoin College Library.  
Buffalo, N. Y.: Young Men's Library.  
Burlington, Vt.: University of Vermont.  
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard College Library.  
Champaign, Ill.: Illinois Industrial University.  
Chicago, Ill.: Public Library.  
Cleveland, O.: Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.  
Crawfordsville, Ind.: Wabash College Library.  
Davidson, N. C.: Davidson College Library.  
Easton, Pa.: Lafayette College Library.  
Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University.  
Geneva, N. Y.: Hobart College Library.  
Greencastle, Ind.: Indiana Asbury University.  
Hanover, N. H.: Dartmouth College Library.  
Iowa City, Iowa: State University of Iowa.  
Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University.  
Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University.  
Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University.

New York, N. Y. : Astor Library.  
 New York, N. Y. : Union Theological Seminary.  
 Philadelphia, Pa. : American Philosophical Society.  
 Philadelphia, Pa. : The Library Company of Philadelphia.  
 Philadelphia, Pa. : The Mercantile Library.  
 Providence, R. I. : Brown University.  
 Providence, R. I. : Providence Athenæum.  
 Sewanee, Tenn. : University of the South.  
 Springfield, Mass. : City Library.  
 Tuscaloosa, Ala. : University of Alabama.  
 University of Virginia : University Library.  
 Washington, D. C. : Library of Congress.  
 Waterville, Maine : Colby University.  
 Wellesley, Mass. : Wellesley College Library.  
 Windsor, Nova Scotia : King's College Library.  
 Worcester, Mass. : Free Public Library.

[Number of American Institutions, 44.]

---

TO THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS HAVE BEEN SENT COMPLETE SETS (VOLUMES I.—XIII.) OF THE TRANSACTIONS.

British Museum, London, England.  
 Royal Asiatic Society, London.  
 Philological Society, London.  
 Society of Biblical Archæology, London.  
 India Office Library, London.  
 Bodleian Library, Oxford.  
 Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, Scotland.  
 Trinity College Library, Dublin, Ireland.  
 Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.  
 Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.  
 North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Shanghai.  
 Japan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Yokohama.  
 Public Library of Victoria, Melbourne.  
 Sir George Grey's Library, Cape Town, Africa.  
 Reykyavik College Library, Iceland.  
 University of Christiania, Norway.  
 University of Upsala, Sweden.  
 Russian Imperial Academy, St. Petersburg.  
 Austrian Imperial Academy, Vienna.  
 Anthropologische Gesellschaft, Vienna.  
 Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence, Italy.  
 Reale Accademia delle Scienze, Turin.

Société Asiatique, Paris, France.

Athénée Oriental, Paris.

Curatorium of the University, Leyden, Holland.

Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Batavia, Java.

Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, Berlin.

Royal Saxon Academy of Sciences, Leipsic.

Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, Munich.

Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Halle.

University of Bonn.

University of Jena.

University of Königsberg.

University of Leipsic.

University of Tübingen.

[Number of Foreign Institutions, 35.]

[Total,  $(221 + 44 + 35 =) 300.$ ]

CONSTITUTION  
OF THE  
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

---

ARTICLE I. — NAME AND OBJECT.

1. This Society shall be known as "The American Philological Association."
2. Its object shall be the advancement and diffusion of philological knowledge.

ARTICLE II. — OFFICERS.

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and Curator, and a Treasurer.
2. There shall be an Executive Committee of ten, composed of the above officers and five other members of the Association.
3. All the above officers shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.

ARTICLE III. — MEETINGS.

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in the city of New York, or at such other place as at a preceding annual meeting shall be determined upon.
2. At the annual meeting, the Executive Committee shall present an annual report of the progress of the Association.
3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the annual meeting shall be directed by the Executive Committee.
4. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Executive Committee, when and where they may decide.

ARTICLE IV. — MEMBERS.

1. Any lover of philological studies may become a member of the Association by a vote of the Executive Committee and the payment of five dollars as initiation fee, which initiation fee shall be considered the first regular annual fee.

2. There shall be an annual fee of three dollars from each member, failure in payment of which for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.

3. Any person may become a life member of the Association by the payment of fifty dollars to its treasury, and by vote of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V. — SUNDRIES.

1. All papers intended to be read before the Association must be submitted to the Executive Committee before reading, and their decision regarding such papers shall be final.

2. Publications of the Association, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VI. — AMENDMENTS.

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two thirds of those present at any regular meeting subsequent to that in which they have been proposed.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

---

THE annually published "Proceedings" of the American Philological Association contain an account of the doings at the annual meeting, brief abstracts of the papers read, reports upon the progress of the Association, and lists of its officers and members.

The annually published "Transactions" give the full text of such articles as the Executive Committee decide to publish. The Proceedings are bound with them as an Appendix.

The following tables show the authors and contents of the first twelve volumes of Transactions :

### 1869-1870. — Volume I.

- Hadley, J. : On the nature and theory of the Greek accent.  
Whitney, W. D. : On the nature and designation of the accent in Sanskrit.  
Goodwin, W. W. : On the aorist subjunctive and future indicative with *ὅπως* and *οὐ μή*.  
Trumbull, J. Hammond : On the best method of studying the North American languages.  
Haldeman, S. S. : On the German vernacular of Pennsylvania.  
Whitney, W. D. : On the present condition of the question as to the origin of language.  
Lounsbury, T. R. : On certain forms of the English verb which were used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.  
Trumbull, J. Hammond : On some mistaken notions of Algonkin grammar, and on mistranslations of words from Eliot's Bible, etc.  
VanName, A. : Contributions to Creole grammar.  
Proceedings of the preliminary meeting (New York, 1868), of the first annual session (Poughkeepsie, 1869), and of the second annual session (Rochester, 1870).

### 1871. — Volume II.

- Evans, E. W. : Studies in Cymric philology.  
Allen, F. D. : On the so-called Attic second declension.  
Whitney, W. D. : Strictures on the views of August Schleicher respecting the nature of language and kindred subjects.  
Hadley, J. : On English vowel quantity in the thirteenth century and in the nineteenth.  
March, F. A. : Anglo-Saxon and Early English pronunciation.  
Bristed, C. A. : Some notes on Ellis's Early English Pronunciation.

Trumbull, J. Hammond : On Algonkin names for man.

Greenough, J. B. : On some forms of conditional sentences in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit.

Proceedings of the third annual session, New Haven, 1871.

### 1872. — Volume III.

Evans, E. W. : Studies in Cymric philology.

Trumbull, J. Hammond : Words derived from Indian languages of North America.

Hadley, J. : On the Byzantine Greek pronunciation of the tenth century, as illustrated by a manuscript in the Bodleian Library.

Stevens, W. A. : On the substantive use of the Greek participle.

Bristed, C. A. : Erroneous and doubtful uses of the word *such*.

Hartt, C. F. : Notes on the Lingoa Geral, or Modern Tupí of the Amazonas.

Whitney, W. D. : On material and form in language.

March, F. A. : Is there an Anglo-Saxon language ?

March, F. A. : On some irregular verbs in Anglo-Saxon.

Trumbull, J. Hammond : Notes on forty versions of the Lord's Prayer in Algonkin languages.

Proceedings of the fourth annual session, Providence, 1872.

### 1873. — Volume IV.

Allen, F. D. : The Epic forms of verbs in *dω*.

Evans, E. W. : Studies in Cymric philology.

Hadley, J. : On Koch's treatment of the Celtic element in English.

Haldeman, S. S. : On the pronunciation of Latin, as presented in several recent grammars.

Packard, L. R. : On some points in the life of Thucydides.

Goodwin, W. W. : On the classification of conditional sentences in Greek syntax.

March, F. A. : Recent discussions of Grimm's law.

Lull, E. P. : Vocabulary of the language of the Indians of San Blas and Caledonia Bay, Darien.

Proceedings of the fifth annual session, Easton, 1873.

### 1874. — Volume V.

Tyler, W. S. : On the prepositions in the Homeric poems.

Harkness, A. : On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.

Haldeman, S. S. : On an English vowel-mutation, present in *cag*, *keg*.

Packard, L. R. : On a passage in Homer's *Odyssey* (x. 81-86).

Trumbull, J. Hammond : On numerals in American Indian languages, and the Indian mode of counting.

Sewall, J. B. : On the distinction between the subjunctive and optative modes in Greek conditional sentences.



Morris, C. D. : On the age of Xenophon at the time of the Anabasis.

Whitney, W. D. : *Φύσει* or *θέσει* — natural or conventional ?

Proceedings of the sixth annual session, Hartford, 1874.

### 1875.— Volume VI.

Harkness, A. : On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.

Haldeman, S. S. : On an English consonant-mutation, present in *proof*, *prove*.

Carter, F. : On Begemann's views as to the weak preterit of the Germanic verbs.

Morris, C. D. : On some forms of Greek conditional sentences.

Williams, A. : On verb-reduplication as a means of expressing completed action.

Sherman, L. A. : A grammatical analysis of the Old English poem "The Owl and the Nightingale."

Proceedings of the seventh annual session, Newport, 1875.

### 1876.— Volume VII.

Gildersleeve, B. L. : On *εἰ* with the future indicative and *ἐάν* with the subjunctive in the tragic poets.

Packard, L. R. : On Grote's theory of the structure of the Iliad.

Humphreys, M. W. : On negative commands in Greek.

Toy, C. H. : On Hebrew verb-etymology.

Whitney, W. D. : A botanico-philological problem.

Goodwin, W. W. : On *shall* and *should* in protasis, and their Greek equivalents.

Humphreys, M. W. : On certain influences of accent in Latin iambic trimeters.

Trumbull, J. Hammond : On the Algonkin verb.

Haldeman, S. S. : On a supposed mutation between *l* and *u*.

Proceedings of the eighth annual session, New York, 1876.

### 1877.— Volume VIII.

Packard, L. R. : Notes on certain passages in the Phaedo and the Gorgias of Plato.

Toy, C. H. : On the nominal basis of the Hebrew verb.

Allen, F. D. : On a certain apparently pleonastic use of *ὡς*.

Whitney, W. D. : On the relation of surd and sonant.

Holden, E. S. : On the vocabularies of children under two years of age.

Goodwin, W. W. : On the text and interpretation of certain passages in the Agamemnon of Aeschylus.

Stickney, A. : On the single case-form in Italian.

Carter, F. : On Willmann's theory of the authorship of the Nibelungenlied.

Sihler, E. G. : On Herodotus's and Aeschylus's accounts of the battle of Salamis.

Whitney, W. D. : On the principle of economy as a phonetic force.

Carter, F. : On the Kurenberg hypothesis.

March, F. A. : On dissimilated gemination.

Proceedings of the ninth annual session, Baltimore, 1877.

**1878. — Volume IX.**

- Gildersleeve, B. L. : Contributions to the history of the articular infinitive.  
Toy, C. H. : The Yoruban language.  
Humphreys, M. W. : Influence of accent in Latin dactylic hexameters.  
Sachs, J. : Observations on Plato's Cratylus.  
Seymour, T. D. : On the composition of the Cynegeticus of Xenophon.  
Humphreys, M. W. : Elision, especially in Greek.

Proceedings of the tenth annual session, Saratoga, 1878.

**1879. — Volume X.**

- Toy, C. H. : Modal development of the Semitic verb.  
Humphreys, M. W. : On the nature of cæsure.  
Humphreys, M. W. : On certain effects of elision.  
Cook, A. S. : Studies in the Heliand.  
Harkness, A. : On the development of the Latin subjunctive in principal clauses.  
D'Ooge, M. L. : The original recension of the De Corona.  
Peck, T. : The authorship of the Dialogus de Oratoribus.  
Seymour, T. D. : On the date of the Prometheus of Aeschylus.

Proceedings of the eleventh annual session, Newport, 1879.

**1880. — Volume XI.**

- Humphreys, M. W. : A contribution to infantile linguistic.  
Toy, C. H. : The Hebrew verb-termination *un*.  
Packard, L. R. : The beginning of a written literature in Greece.  
Hall, I. H. : The declension of the definite article in the Cypriote inscriptions.  
Sachs, J. : Observations on Lucian.  
Sihler, E. G. : Virgil and Plato.  
Allen, W. F. : The battle of Mons Graupius.  
Whitney, W. D. : On inconsistency in views of language.  
Edgren, A. H. : The kindred Germanic words of German and English, exhibited with reference to their consonant relations.

Proceedings of the twelfth annual session, Philadelphia, 1880.

**1881. — Volume XII.**

- Whitney, W. D. : On Mixture in Language.  
Toy, C. H. : The home of the primitive Semitic race.  
March, F. A. : Report of the committee on the reform of English spelling.  
Wells, B. W. : History of the *a*-vowel, from Old Germanic to Modern English.  
Seymour, T. D. : The use of the aorist participle in Greek.  
Sihler, E. G. : The use of abstract verbal nouns in *-σας* in Thucydides.

Proceedings of the thirteenth annual session, Cleveland, 1881.

**1882. — Volume XIII.**

- Hall, I. H. : The Greek New Testament as published in America.  
Merriam, A. C. : Alien intrusion between article and noun in Greek.  
Peck, T. : Notes on Latin quantity.  
Owen, W. B. : Influence of the Latin syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.  
Wells, B. W. : The Ablaut in English.  
Whitney, W. D. : General considerations on the Indo-European case-system.  
Proceedings of the fourteenth annual session, Cambridge, 1882.

The Proceedings of the American Philological Association are distributed gratis upon application until they are out of print.

Separate copies of articles printed in the Transactions are given to the authors for distribution.

The “Transactions *for*” any given year are not always published in that year. To avoid mistakes in ordering back volumes, please state — not the year of publication, but rather — the year *for* which the Transactions are desired, adding also the volume-number, according to the following table :

The Transactions for 1869 <i>and</i> 1870 form Volume I.					
“	“	“	1871	form	Volume II.
“	“	“	1872	“	“ III.
“	“	“	1873	“	“ IV.
“	“	“	1874	“	“ V.
“	“	“	1875	“	“ VI.
“	“	“	1876	“	“ VII.
“	“	“	1877	“	“ VIII.
“	“	“	1878	“	“ IX.
“	“	“	1879	“	“ X.
“	“	“	1880	“	“ XI.
“	“	“	1881	“	“ XII.
“	“	“	1882	“	“ XIII.

The price of these volumes is \$1.50 apiece. No reduction is made on orders for less than nine volumes (see p. v). The first two volumes will not be sold separately.

#### TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF COMPLETE SETS.

Single COMPLETE SETS of the Transactions (volumes I.–XIII.) will be sold, until further notice, at thirteen dollars a set.

It is especially appropriate that *American* Libraries should exert themselves to procure this series while it may be had. It is the work of *American* scholars, and contains many valuable articles not elsewhere accessible ; and, aside from these facts, as the first collection of essays in general philology made in this country, it is sure to be permanently valuable for the history of American scholarship.